The AFB Study of Support Services to Visually Impaired Students in the State of Florida

July 1985

For

Florida Instructional Materials Center
for the Visually Handicapped

Hillsborough County Schools
Tampa Florida

The Florida Department of Education
Division of Public Schools
Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students

Prepared by:

Dr. Kathleen Mary Huebner
Ms. Julia Holton Todd
Dr. LaRhea Sanford
Dr. Anne L. Corn

American Foundation for the Blind
15 West 16th St., New York, NY 10011

V2120
87
3

M.C. MIGEL MEMORIAL LIBRARY
American Foundation for the Blind
15 West 16th Street, New York, New York
10011

HV2120
H87
c.3

The AFB Study of Support Services
to Visually Impaired Students
in the State of Florida

July 1985

For

Florida Instructional Materials Center
for the Visually Handicapped

Hillsborough County Schools
Tampa Florida

The Florida Department of Education
Division of Public Schools
Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students

Prepared by:

Dr. Kathleen Mary Huebner
Ms. Julia Holton Todd
Dr. LaRhea Sanford
Dr. Anne L. Corn

American Foundation for the Blind
15 West 16th St., New York, NY 10011

HV2120
H87
c.3

Table of Contents

I Purpose of Study..1

II Design of Study..2
- A. Review of Existing Records/Materials........................3
- B. Interviews..4
- C. Survey..6
- D. Analysis of Survey Data and Verification........................8

III Materials Results..10
Introduction..10

Survey Question 1 (as needed)..16
- A. Results..16
- B. Analysis..16
- C. Recommendations..17

Survey Question 2 (quality)..18
- A. Results..18
- B. Analysis..18
- C. Recommendations..20

Survey Question 3 (current editions)..21
- A. Results..21
- B. Analysis..21
- C. Recommendations..23

Survey Question 4 (delivery efficiency)..24
- A. Results..24
- B. Analysis..24
- C. Recommendations..26

Survey Question 5 (new developments)..27
- A. Results..27
- B. Analysis..27

C. Recommendations.......................................29

Survey Question 6 (technological equipment).......................30
A. Results.......................................30
B. Analysis.......................................30
C. Recommendations.......................................32

Survey Question 7 (special populations).......................33
A. Results.......................................33
B. Analysis.......................................33
C. Recommendations.......................................34

Survey Question 8 (special subject curricula).......................35
A. Results.......................................35
B. Analysis.......................................35
C. Recommendations.......................................37

Survey Quesion 9 (vision curricula).......................38
A. Results.......................................38
B. Analysis.......................................38
C. Recommendations.......................................40

Survey Question 10 (professional literature).......................41
A. Results.......................................41
B. Analysis.......................................41
C. Recommendations.......................................43

IV Inservice Training Results.......................44
Introduction.......................................44

Survey Question 11 (input).......................48
A. Results.......................................48
B. Analysis.......................................48
C. Recommendations.......................................50

Survey Question 12 (offered locally).......................51
A. Results.......................................51
B. Analysis.......................................51
C. Recommendations.......................................53

Survey Question 13 (offered regionally).......................54

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/afbstudyofsuppor00prep

A. Results.. 54
B. Analysis... 54
C. Recommendations.. 56

Survey Question 14 (offered state-wide)............................. 58
A. Results.. 58
B. Analysis... 58
C. Recommendations.. 60

Survey Question 15 (release time)................................... 61
A. Results.. 61
B. Analysis... 61
C. Recommendations.. 63

Survey Question 16 (reimbursement).................................. 64
A. Results.. 64
B. Analysis... 64
C. Recommendations.. 66

Survey Question 17 (weekend convenience)............................ 67
A. Results.. 67
B. Analysis... 67
C. Recommendations.. 68

Survey Question 18 (relevant information)........................... 69
A. Results.. 69
B. Analysis... 69
C. Recommendations.. 71

Survey Question 19 (agency coordination)............................ 72
A. Results.. 72
B. Analysis... 72
C. Recommendations.. 76

Survey Question 20 (regular education teachers)..................... 79
A. Results.. 79
B. Analysis... 79
C. Recommendations.. 81

V Assessment Results.................................... 83
Introduction.................................... 83

Survey Question 21 (assessors' qualified).................... 85
- A. Results.................................... 85
- B. Analysis.................................... 85
- C. Recommendations.................................... 88

Survey Question 22 (resources and instruments).................... 90
- A. Results.................................... 90
- B. Analysis.................................... 90
- C. Recommendations.................................... 93

Survey Question 23 (basis for placement).................... 94
- A. Results.................................... 94
- B. Analysis.................................... 94
- C. Recommendations.................................... 97

Survey Question 24 (basis for IEP's).................... 98
- A. Results.................................... 98
- B. Analysis.................................... 98
- C. Recommendations.................................... 100

Survey Question 25 (specialized assessments).................... 101
- A. Results.................................... 101
- B. Analysis.................................... 101
- C. Recommendations.................................... 103

Survey Question 26 (special populations).................... 104
- A. Results.................................... 104
- B. Analysis.................................... 104
- C. Recommendations.................................... 106

Survey Question 27 (Florida required).................... 107
- A. Results.................................... 107
- B. Analysis.................................... 107
- C. Recommendations.................................... 109

Survey Question 28 (special skill areas).................... 110
- A. Results.................................... 110
- B. Analysis.................................... 110

C. Recommendations.......................................112

Survey Question 29 (program evaluation)..................113
A. Results...113
B. Analysis..113
C. Recommendations.......................................115

Survey Question 30 (evalution of professionals)..........116
A. Results...116
B. Analysis..116
C. Recommendations.......................................118

VI Additional Recommendations............................119
Limitations..119
Recommendations..119

VII Summary Statement...................................122

VIII Acknowledgements...................................124

Appendices...126
A. List of Materials Reviewed............................126
B. Interview Schedules...................................134
1. Interview Schedules...................................134
2. Interviewees..140
3. Interview Guidelines..................................149
4. Interview Form - Materials............................150
5. Interview Form - Inservice............................151
6. Interview Form - Assessment...........................152
C. Survey Instrument.....................................153
1. Survey Pilot Form.....................................153
2. Final Survey Form.....................................160
3. Cover Letter from Wendy Culler.......................162
D. Survey Results..163

I. Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to : (1) review the current status; (2) determine the quality; (3) make recommendations, and; (4) suggest implementation strategies, for three areas of support services being provided directly and indirectly to visually impaired VI students in the State of Florida. The three areas of support services were:

1. MATERIALS - student, parent, and teacher oriented, distribution of braille, large print, tangible apparatus, technological equipment, and other specialized educational materials;

2. INSERVICE - referring to conferences and workshops conducted for parents, volunteers, para-professionals, and professionals involved in the education of visually impaired students; and,

3. ASSESSMENT- the provision of pertinent, ongoing formal and informal student assessment and evaluation information, and application as well as program and teacher evalution.

II. Design of Study

The study design included three distinct methods/phases of data collection: a review of existing materials and records; a mailed survey instrument; and on-site interviews. The result sections are organized by the three support service areas and include findings obtained through all three phases.

A team of consultants was hired to conduct the study under the coordination of Dr. Susan Spungin, Associate Executive Director of the American Foundation for the Blind (AFB). The team leader was Dr. Kathleen M. Huebner, National Consultant in Education, AFB; Ms. Julia Holton Todd, Coordinator, Ohio Resource Center for Low Incidence and Severely Handicapped; Dr. LaRhea Sanford, Lead Teacher, Vision Programs, Nashville Public Schools; and Dr. Anne L. Corn, Associate Professor, University of Texas at Austin, Department of Special Education. The team members were selected for their expertise in the support service areas targeted in the study, experience in statewide studies, and national professional reputations.

All team members equally procured information, developed the survey instrument, and had input into the analysis of data in all three support service areas. However, the main responsibility for analyzing, verifying and preparing the written report was assigned as follows: Materials - Todd; Inservice - Sanford; Assessment - Corn; and all remaining sections - Huebner. All team members reviewed and edited the final report. All team members were involved in the development of all the recommendations presented in this report.

A. Review of Existing Records/Materials

A set of existing records and materials was provided by the Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Handicapped (FIMCVH) and the Florida Department of Education, Division of Public Schools, Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students (BEES). As the study team reviewed materials and conducted interviews they requested additional materials which were promptly supplied by the FIMCVH. During interviews additional materials were shared with the team by interviewees. A representative list of materials received and reviewed is provided in Appendix A.

The materials initially distributed served to provide a historical perspective, an understanding of administrative structures, and an orientation to the scope of the three support services being studied. Throughout the interview/survey development and analyses,

records and documents provided information and verification for:

Materials - production, delivery, dissemination, local education agency personnel utilization, reciprocity agreements, FIMCVH annual reports and activities, etc.;

Inservice - state policies, local education agency policies, past programs and attendance information, workshops and conferences for parents, teachers, volunteers, support service personnel, and regular education personnel, etc.;

Assessment - existing resources, state policies, availability, dissemination, distribution, application, unique need areas related to special populations such as gifted, bilingual and multi-handicapped and these specifically related to low vision and blindness, etc..

B. Interviews

The team made two separate on-site visitation trips to the state of Florida. All interviewees, appointments, and accommodations were

arranged by the FIMCVH. The team members did identify the types of individuals they thought would be the most appropriate to interview, such as teachers of visually impaired students from both surburban and rural school districts, FDLRS personnnel, BEES personnel, FIMCVH personnel, parents, visually impaired students, volunteers, state and local school districts administrators and program supervisors. The interviews were conducted during March and May in Jacksonville, St. Augustine, Miami, and Tampa. Schedules and lists of those interviewed are provided in Appendix B-1 and B-2.

The interview guidelines (Appendix B-3) were developed by Dr. Huebner, Team Leader with input by Corinne Kirchner, Director of Social Research Department at AFB. They were then reviewed by the team and based on reviewed documents and professional experience, the interview forms (Appendix B-4, B-5, and B-6) were developed. A separate interview guide form was developed for each of the support service areas materials, inservice, and assessment. Key points to be covered with each interviewee were listed on the form and space provided for note-taking.

Following each day's interviews the team met, shared, and reviewed each other's findings. This process facilitated the team in the recognition of trends, strengths, and weaknesses. This process, coupled with the review of documents, assisted the team in the development of the survey instrument and the determination of the

target sample surveyed. The process also helped the team to decide the types of individuals to interview during the second on-site visitation.

C. Survey

During the team's first on-site interview visitation the pilot survey form (Appendix C-1) was developed by the team. Content was limited to ten statements addressing the most critical issues for each of the three support areas being studied. A Likert scale was provided for response to each statement.

The survey instrument was reviewed by Corinne Kirchner, Director of Social Research at AFB, and then piloted by the same department's staff. The pilot was conducted by telephone due to time constraints. Because all the relevant staff from FDLRS, BEES, DBS, and FSU were to be sent the final survey, and they were few in number, they were not included in the pilot study. A sample of teachers, volunteers, and parents were randomly selected from lists provided by FIMCVH for the pilot study. The pilot study revealed that the volunteers and parents did not feel they were in a position to answer the majority of the questions with any degree of authority. The teachers, however, provided input which helped to clarify the presentation of some of the survey statements. Communication among team members, the AFB Social

Research staff, and Dr. Susan Spungin, Coordinator of the Project, concluded that volunteers and parents would be the focus of the second on-site interviews and the survey instrument would not be sent to them.

As a result of the pilot study, modifications were made which resulted in the finalized survey instruent (Appendix C-2). The final form was submitted to BEES for approval and an assigned identification number (ESE 055 EXP 630-85) was issued. Following approval, Dr. Wendy Culler, Chief of BEES, provided a cover letter to accompany the survey instrument (Appendix C-3).

Three hundred and thirteen instruments were mailed. Detailed response information is provided in Appendix D. However, an explanation of the selection process for survey recipients is presented here. Relevant BEES staff (16); DBS staff (16); FDLRS Administrators (27); FIMCVH staff (10); and FSU staff (4) were selected based on their familiarity and direct contact with programs for VI students. Twenty-five percent (26) of the LEA administrative special education staff members and supervisors of programs were randomly selected, 100% of the school district teachers of VI students (154), and 100% of the residential school teachers, dormitory staff, and administrators (60), were sent survey instruments. One hundred and fifty-four survey instruments were returned. This represents a 49.2%

return rate. According to the AFB Social Research Department, this far exceeds an acceptable rate of return.

D. Analysis of Survey Data and Verification

The analysis of the survey data is straight forward and uncomplicated. Results are presented by groups, frequency, and percentages of responses. Each survey statement and its responses are dealt with in detail in sections: III-Materials Results; IV-Inservice Training Results; and V-Assessment Results.
The results, analysis, and recommendations are presented for each statement. The analysis and recommendations sections for each statement include the application of data collected through all three phases of the study: records and document review; interviews; and survey results. Team members also made follow-up phone calls as they found it necessary.

In the following data, percentages of all respondents are utilized within a professional grouping. Therefore, if 10% of the respondents state that they don't know the answer (D/K), the totals for other reported percentages will account for 90% of the respondents. It is concluded that those who responded to the questionnaires should be in positions for which they should have some understanding of a majority of the issues questioned, e.g., a teacher who is not knowledgeable about whether an assessment is carried out by

a qualified professional should not have her response to that question disregarded. Terminology presented relates to those terms used by those professionals who were interviewed, rather than more common language e.g. VI refers to visually impaired.

In most instances the largest frequencies of the data fell in the mid-range i.e. in the "generally" or "rarely" categories. Because of the forced choice of a positive or a negative response, data are analyzed primarily in regard to whether they offer positive (generally or always) rather than negative (rarely or never) orientations. For each of the questions the total number of respondents was 154; for teachers, N=102; and for nonteachers, N=52.

It was felt that teachers of VI students would be directly knowledgeable of the information included in the survey. The responses of teachers were, therefore, examined as a group. It is important to note that approximately one fifth of the teachers who responded to the study were serving visually impaired students but reported that they were not certified by the state of Florida to do so.

III Materials Results

Introduction

Often, the adequacy and appropriateness of the education of visually impaired students is dependent upon access to specialized materials. Students may need textbooks in large print, braille, and/or on tape; specialized equipment ranging from inexpensive magnifiers to expensive, complex electronic equipment. In addition, parents and teachers need acccess to materials, including audio-visual programs, that will assist them in increasing their own knowledge. A wide variety of materials that cover the interests and activities of students, parents, and educators should be provided in a timely and efficient manner. There are a number of agencies that provide materials. Major resources are briefly described below.

FIMCVH

Clearly, the major responsibility for materials distribution is

with the Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Handicapped. Florida Statute 233.056 indicates that FIMCVH is a:

> "coordinating unit and instructional materials center for visually handicapped and hearing-impaired children and youth to provide staff and resources for the coordination, cataloging, standardizing, producing, procuring, storing, and distributing of braille, large print, tangible apparatus, captioned films and video tapes, and other specialized educational materials needed by these students and other exceptional students. The coordinating unit shall have as its major purpose the improvement of instructional programs for visually handicapped and hearing impaired students and may, as a second priority, extend appropriate services to other exceptional students, consistent with provisions and criteria established, to the extent that resources are available."

The FIMCVH Project Application states that it will:

> "house, produce, purchase, and distribute specialized materials for visually impaired students through grade twelve. As appropriate, the Center will assist in obtaining materials for other exceptional students. The Center will provide coordination

> and training for volunteers who provide specialized materials."

The overall goal is the improvement of educational services delivery to visually impaired and other exceptional children in Florida. The Project Application also states that the State Steering Committee for the Visually Impaired shall assist the center in establishing priorities, reviewing guidelines and procedures, and identifying emerging needs for materials and media.

FSDB

The memorandum of agreement between FSDB and BEES (2/21/84), approved by Ralph Turlington, states that FSDB will:

> "provide materials resources to district programs statewide...specialized curriculum materials and specialized training materials, cooperate with FIMCVH in acquisition and use of textbook materials, assessment materials, and technological aides, and training for use of Optacon,..., and cooperate with BEES, FDLRS and district programs in the development and validation of resource materials to meet program priorities and assessed needs."

A computer resource center has been funded at FSDB. The project goals indicate that the staff will evaluate, modify software, pilot test, disseminate information and materials as well as conduct inservice. Although this is stated in the project, interviews revealed that these activities are being targeted with the deaf students only. The goal of the center is to "see that microcomputers become a critical factor in the eductional experience of sensory impaired children the state of Florida."

FSDB is to develop and disseminate a compendium of programs, resources, and services available through FSDB and to cooperate with FIMCVH, FDLRS, and other agencies in the development and validation of resource materials to meet program priorities and assessed needs. The February 1984 memorandum of agreement between the FSDB Outreach Project and BEES states that FSDB shall cooperate with FDLRS Associate Centers and distict programs in providing resources and services including consultation and information services.

DBS

A draft of a memorandum of understanding (no date) between the Division of Blind Services and the Division of Public Schools states that DBS will make available services to eligible clients including "technological aids or equipment, books, training materials, equipment and technological aids for training or employment."

The memorandum of understanding (1/85) between the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services and the Department of Education, Division of Blind Services states that, "depending upon economic need and availability of other resources, clients may receive eye medical care, glasses, and other visual aids, and appliances to assist in independent living." The Division of Blind Services Medical and Social Services Program Handbook states that they will provide "other specific training aids (those not supplied on quota), books, supplies, equipment based on economic need and require approval by unit supervisor and district director before purchase."

DOE

Florida Department of Education - In the memorandum of understanding between the Division of Blind Services and the Division of Public Schools, Florida Department of Education (no date, draft) both divisions agree to cooperate in the dissemination of information and other public relations activities to increase public awareness of visual impairments and educational and related services availability to visually impaired persons."

FDLRS/TECH, one of the specialized FDLRS centers, is to assist in the implementation of effective application of instructional technology in exceptional student education. It will assist the other

FDLRS Centers in acquiting the resources to deliver direct services in the area of instructional technology to the district programs they serve.

Question 1 - YOU GET INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS (braille textbooks, cassette recorders, etc.) NEEDED BY YOUR STUDENTS.

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	always	60.4%	69.2%	42.0%
	generally	23.4%	24.0%	22.0%
	rarely	3.9%	2.9%	6.0%
	never	1.9%	1.9%	2.0%
	N/A	7.8%	1.9%	20.0%
	D/K	2.6%	0 %	8.0%

Analysis

Eighty-three percent of the people surveyed indicated that they always (60%) or generally (23%) get the instructional materials needed by their students. This response was strongly and consistently supported in the interviews. However, FSDB staff had varying understandings about what they could and could not receive from FIMCVH.

Recommendations

1. The relationship between FIMCVH and FSDB needs to be clarified and communicated.

2. The letter of agreement between FSDB and BEES (2-21-84) needs to be clarified. FSDB's responsibilities for sharing materials with LEAs is not clear.

3. FIMCVH should revise its handbook so that teachers can have current information.

4. The FIMCVH Handbook should be given to each teacher of visually impaired students.

QUESTION 2 - THE QUALITY (readable braille, high contract large print, etc.) OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IS

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	excellent	20.8%	22.1%	18.0%
	good	55.8%	62.5%	42.0%
	fair	6.5%	7.7%	4.0%
	poor	0. %	0. %	0. %
	N/A	11.0%	5.8%	22.0%
	D/K	5.8%	1.9%	14.0%

Analysis

Fifty-five persons of the respondents said that the quality of the materials is good. Twenty-one percent indicated materials were of excellent quality. No one stated that they received poor quality materials.

Among the persons interviewed, there was general agreeement that the quality of the materials from FIMCVH and the American Printing House for the Blind (APH) was very good. A few concerns, however, were mentioned such as: poor reproduction of diagrams, sample

problems, and graphs; no substitiution for color dependent format; tapes from Recording for the Blind (RFB) sometimes have chapters missing; and lack of flexibility in size of enlarged textbooks.

FIMCVH is very committed to the production of quality materials. Their volunteer program is large and well coordinated.

Recommendations

1. A formal mechanism for annual reporting of concerns about the quality of large print and braille books and tapes should be developed. An evaluation form could be printed in the FIMCVH newsletter.

2. FIMCVH should develop a mechanism for disseminating the information about the quality of materials to the appropriate agencies.

QUESTION 3 - YOU GET CURRENT EDITIONS OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	always	60.4%	21.1%	20.0%
	generally	23.4%	65.4%	38.0%
	rarely	3.9%	7.7%	0. %
	never	1.95%	1.9%	0. %
	N/A	7.8%	1.9%	30.0%
	D/K	2.6%	1.9%	12.0%

Analysis

"Generally" was the response given by 56% of the respondents. Twenty-one percent said that they always get current editions of educational materials. Persons interviewed supported the survey results. The staff at FSDB expressed two major concerns. The first, funding to secure current textbooks in large print, braille, and regular print, and teacher editions with the same copyright. Second, current materials are particularly needed in career/vocational education, geography, business, math and science.

With the funding and implementation of the braille automation project, FIMCVH should be able to provide current editions in braille

in a more timely manner, Florida's RAISE bill has provided immense challenges for the materials delivery system by requiring a wider variety of titles with current editions.

Recommendations

1. FSDB should make every effort to maintain current editions of textbooks, including teacher editions, in all formats needed by the students.

QUESTION 4 - THE EFFICIENCY OF THE DELIVERY OF MATERIALS IS:

Results

	Total	Teacher	All Other
ontime	14.9 %	12.5 %	10.0%
usually ontime	57.8 %	69.2 %	34.0%
usually late	12.3 %	13.5 %	10.0%
always late	.65%	.96%	0. %
N/A	9.1 %	2.9 %	22.0%
D/K	5.2 %	.96%	14.0%

Analysis

"On time" (15%) or "usually on time" (58%) were the responses of 73% of the people surveyed. These results were also confirmed in the interviews. Problems arose when orders weren't submitted early enough, students transferred from FSDB to LEA's and/or when communication between the regular and itinerant teacher was not timely. In some cases, the book had to be transcribed and the braillist did not keep ahead of the student. A problem arises when students need materials that are not available from the normal sources, APH or FIMCVH. This is especially critical for students in advanced classes, those that

needed advanced texts and access to research and other library materials. Delivery is often delayed due to the material's being backordered by APH. Problems also arise at the beginning of a new school year if a school district recieves a new student who needs special materials.

FIMCVH, with major responsibility for materials delivery, is to be commended for maintaining an excellent materials delivery system. FIMCVH, with its foresight, and quality staff has become recognized nationally. As a result, it is used as a model for replication and program development.

Recommendations

1. The current delivery system should be continued.

2. FIMCVH should be complimented for its initiative in developing the braille automation project. The project should continue to be supported by DOE.

QUESTION 5 - YOU GET INFORMATION ON NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN TECHNOLOGY (Paperless braillers, computer access equipment, etc.)

		Total	Teacher	All Other
Results	always	24.0%	24.0 %	24.0%
	generally	53.3%	56.7 %	46.0%
	rarely	8.4%	10.6 %	4.0%
	never	4.6%	5.8 %	2.0%
	N/A	5.8%	.96%	16.0%
	D/K	3.9%	1.9 %	8.0%

Analysis

Seventy-seven percent (77%) of the people surveyed felt that they always (24%) or generally (53%) get information on new developments in technology.

However, the interview process revealed that even those persons who thought they were well-informed, when questioned further (within two years of a development), were found to be uninformed. Therefore, the results of this question are to be interpreted with caution.

Project CAISH and FDLRS/TECH are addressing the technology needs of visually impaired students. Technical assistance in hardware and software selection and adaptations are provided by personnel wihin these projects. Interviewed teachers were unaware of the efforts of Project CAISH and FDLRS/TECH. Teachers need to be informed so they can access the information. While there are a number of agencies that disseminate information on technology there is little effort that this effort is coordinated so that the information is distributed comprehensively and efficiently.

Recommendations

1. Develop a plan for collecting, coordinating; and disseminating information about technological developments relevant to parents and educators of visually impaired students.

2. The state should establish an easily accessable central resource for teachers, parents, and students to obtain information regarding availability, accessibility, cost, instructional strategies, etc. - related to technological equipment (paperless braillers, computers).

3. This service should be placed at an existing statewide service facility, i.e.FIMCVH, FSDB or FDLRS/TECH. The exact placement should be determined by a statewide committee after careful consideration of each agency and its capability for providing such a service.

QUESTION 6 - YOU GET THE TECHNOLOGY EQUIPMENT YOUR STUDENTS NEED.

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	always	14.9%	16.4 %	12.0%
	generally	48.0%	46.2 %	52.0%
	rarely	18.0%	25.0 %	4.0%
	never	6.5%	.96%	0. %
	N/A	13.6%	10.6 %	20.0%
	D/K	4.6%	.96%	12.0%

Analysis

Response to this question varied widely. Fifteen percent (15%) responded always, 48% generally, and 18% rarely. The interview comments on technology were also varied. Some interviewees identified specific pieces of equipment needed, while others, including parents, thought they had what was needed. Others felt that visually impaired students were not getting access to computers and that VI students were quickly falling behind their sighted peers. Computer peripherals and software are needed so visually impaired students can access information and equipment being used by nonhandicapped students.Equipment deficiencies were also noted by the FSDB staff, for

example, the computers were purchased without voice synthesizers or large print screens.

It is interesting to note that over 10% of the teachers responded that this question was not applicable to them. Two questions arose from this result. Is the question of technological equipment not applicable because students are being judged as not capable of using equipment (i.e. severely developmentally delayed) or do teachers, due to lack of funding, administrative support, or complex procedures to secure equipment, consider the procurement of equipment impossible. Regardless of the reason, this issue warrants further investigation.

Recommendations

1. Establish a statewide loan service for evaluation purposes of optical and electronic access technology. Ethical and professional considerations should be very carefully weighed.

2. The state should develop a plan for integrated technology into vocational assessment and training programs.

3. Under the direction of DOE/BEES, each LEA and FSDB should develop a plan and make every effort to secure and maintain technology equipment for VI students.

4. Teachers need preservice and inservice training on technological developments, their use, and teaching strategies.

5. Teachers need to be trained in how to integrate the use of technology into the students' total educational program.

QUESTION 7 - YOU GET MATERIALS NEEDED BY/FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS (gifted, multi-handicapped, bilingual, etc.)

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	always	9.7%	9.6%	10.0%
	generally	54.6%	58.7%	46.0%
	rarely	11.0%	11.5%	10.0%
	never	3.3%	4.5%	0. %
	N/A	16.2%	12.5%	24.0%
	D/K	5.2%	2.9%	10.0%

Analysis

There was a wider range of responses on this question than on previous ones. Fifty-five percent responded generally, 10% always, and 11% rarely. Persons interviewed indicated that: more items needed to be available for multihandicapped students and advanced braille readers; and blind students do not have access to library and research materials. Advanced students often are unable to do independent study, enter competitions, and do other activities because of the lack of access to research materials.

Recommendations

1. The state of Florida needs to study the status of the accessibility and adequacy of materials for bilingual students.

2. The adequacy and accessibility of materials for multihandicapped/visually impaired students needs to be studied.

3. A plan needs to be developed to deal with materials needs of advanced students. This would include cooperative activities between FSU, FIMCVH, BEES, DBS, and FSDB and FDLRS. (This is a need of non-handicapped students as well, even though it was not evidenced in the study.)

QUESTION 8 - YOU GET SPECIAL SUBJECT AREA CURRICULA MATERIALS (career/vocational education, music, etc.)

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	always	7.1%	7.7%	6.0%
	generally	43.5%	45.2%	40.0%
	rarely	17.5%	19.2%	14.0%
	never	4.6%	5.8%	2.0%
	N/A	19.5%	15.4%	28.0%
	D/K	7.8%	6.7%	10.0%

Analysis

Forty-three percent (43%) responded that they generally get special subject area curricula materials. Seven percent (7%) said always and 18% said rarely. This response is an interestingly high and positive one considering the paucity of special subject area curricula materials available in the field of education for visually impaired students. With this in mind, it is quite possible that the phrasing of this statement prevented the acquisition of true

responses. The intent of this question may have been misunderstood due to a poorly phrased statement. Nineteen percent (19%) of the teachers said they rarely get the materials they need and 6% of them said they never get the materials they need. This was not a strong area of concern mentioned in the interviews. However, this could be due to the fact that it was not one of the main interview questions (Appendix B-4) rather than because it is not a concern. Several persons did mention the need for career and vocational materials.

Recommendations

1. A statewide study be conducted to determine which special subject area curricula materials are being used by teachers and to determine special subject area curricula needs.

2. A statewide library of special curricula area materials needs to be established. The FIMCVH is probably the logical place for such a collection.

QUESTION 9 - YOU GET CURRICULA FOR SPECIAL SUBJECT AREAS UNIQUE TO VISION (daily living skills, orientation and mobility, etc.)

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	always	15.6%	13.5%	20.0%
	generally	39.6%	41.2%	36.0%
	rarely	21.4%	25.0%	14.0%
	never	6.5%	8.7%	2.0%
	N/A	11.7%	7.7%	20.0%
	D/K	5.2%	3.9%	8.0%

Analysis

Sixteen percent (16%) said always, 40% said generally, and 21% said rarely. Persons interviewed said that they needed more materials on orientation and mobility.

This response, as in question 8, is interesting considering the paucity of available materials in subject areas unique to vision. With this in mind, it is quite possible that the survey statement was

poorly phrased and, therefore, the survey responses are not accurate. FSDB teachers expressed a need for more textbooks in regular print.

Recommendations

1. Regular print materials should be made available to students using optical aids and for those students having normal visual acuity with perphial field loss.

2. A statewide study should be conducted to determine which curricula for special subject areas unique to vision are being used and what is needed.

3. A statewide library of curricula for special subject areas unique to vision should be established. The FIMCVH might be the logical place for such a collection.

QUESTION 10 - YOU HAVE READY ACCESS TO CURRENT LITERATURE (journals, books, pamphlets)

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	always	22.1 %	21.2 %	24.0%
	generally	51.95%	52.9 %	50.0%
	rarely	14.9 %	20.2 %	4.0%
	never	3.3 %	4.8 %	0. %
	N/A	3.9 %	0. %	12.0%
	D/K	3.9 %	.96%	10.0%

Analysis

Fifty-two percent (52%) indicated that they do have ready access to current literature. Twenty-two percent (22%) said always, 15% rarely, and 3% never.

During the interviews, teachers and parents stated they need access to a wider variety of library materials so they can keep

current and secure information. In addition, a person commented that audio-visual programs are needed so they can be used in teacher training. One person commented that she did not get much from FDLRS and that she needed to know what they have. Another teacher said that she goes to FDLRS, but they need to have more pertaining to the visually impaired student.

Recommendations

1. A statewide library for parents and educators needs to be established and to be easily accessible to anyone working with visually impaired students.

2. LEA and FSDB administrators should strongly encourage their teachers to use such a service, and other available resources, to maintain their professional growth and development.

IV Inservice Training Results

Introduction

There are a number of resources available in the state of Florida that provide inservice training opportunities to persons working with visually impaired students. Major resources and their inservice activities are briefly described below.

BEES : The Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students employs a full-time educational consultant. This person is in charge of offering technical assistance to school districts on request. BEES has a cooperative agreement with FSU to join together in presenting the "Florida Seminar on Visually Impaired: Weekends with the Experts". (Letter of Agreement, see Appendex A-item #27). In addition, program assistance workshop (formerly Special Study Institutes) regional meetings of two days are held which focus on program supervisor organizational needs and teacher curriculum needs. Information is desseminated to ESE Directors, Supervisors, contacts in programs for VI students, FDLRS Centers, FDLRS Specialized Centers, etc. via Technical Assistance Reports published three to four times a year. SpecialNet and special bulletins are also used to disseminate information.

Inservice training is also available at the state level through special state grants which are part of Title VI-B discretionary money. These special projects usually produce a manual and a mechanism for providing inservice relevant to the project. Past projects include topics such as electronic communication devices, low vision stimulation, and orientation and mobility.

FIMCVH : The Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Handicapped is designed as an instructional materials and resource coordinating unit, and in addition, provides technical assistance and inservice training opportunities. The FIMCVH has a toll free number so that teachers can call any time during the work day for assistance. The FIMCVH conducts yearly Optacon and Kurzweil training sessions for teachers of the VI students. They also co-sponsor, with the Visual Aid Volunteers of Florida, an annual training seminar for teachers and volunteers who work with visually impaired students.

FSDB : The Florida School for the Deaf and Blind has a written agreement with BEES to cooperate with the BEES, DBS, HRS, FDLRS Associate and Specialized Centers, and district programs in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of inservice activities relevent to the needs of deaf, blind, and multiply-handicapped students. Communication is increased through participation in

BEES/FSDB quarterly meetings, involvement with the State Advisory Committee, and with FDLRS Network activities as appropriate. FSDB also disseminates information via the Technical Assistance Reports and The Florida School Herald. FSDB is required to have a Master Inservice Plan for their staff.

DBS : The Division of Blind Services sponsors three workshops at Camp Achievement each year for preschool children, their families, and professionals who work with them. DBS has also sponsored workshops at the Conklin Center for students and professionals related to the use of microcomputers and access technology.

FDLRS : Florida has 18 regional Diagnostic and Learning Resource System Centers and nine specialized FDLRS Centers. In addition to other roles, FDLRS centers plan, coordinate, and assist in the implementation of inservice training programs, consistent with each district's program of staff development and updating of attitudes, skills, and diagnostic instructional practices and procedures.

LOCAL_EDUCATIONAL_AGENCIES : The Department of Education requires each of the 68 counties to have a Master Inservice Plan. Someone is usually designated by each county to conduct needs assessments, arrange inservice, and keep records. Larger counties may have a supervisor of VI programs, or program assistant to assist with planning and conducting inservice activities.

STATE CHAPTER OF AERBVI : The state chapter of the Association for the Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired conducts an annual conference. Topics are relevant to the needs of professionals, parents, and para-professionals.

FSU : Florida State University offers the only degreed program in visual disabilities in the state. Courses for certification are offered at other colleges across the state, e.g., Flagler College in St. Augustine and St. Thomas College in Miami. The Florida Legislature mandated that each university in the state offer inservice training to local school systems through The FDLRS centers for gratis.

11. YOU HAVE INPUT REGARDING INSERVICE TOPICS.

Results

	Total	Teachers	All Others
never	5.2%	6.7%	2.0%
rarely	16.9%	19.2%	12%
generally	55.2%	58.7%	48%
always	18.8%	15.4%	26%
N/A	1.9%	0 %	6%
D/K	1.9%	0 %	6%

Analysis

Survey results indicated that 55% of the respondents felt they generally have input regarding inservice topics; 19% felt they always have input; 17% felt they rarely have input; and 5% felt they never have input. A larger percentage of nonteachers than teachers felt they always have input regarding inservice topics. Teachers tended to be more negative than all others combined. They had a higher percentage of responses for rarely and generally having input regarding inservice training topics. Local educational staff and FDLRS staff had the highest rate of responses for thinking they always have input regarding inservice training.

The method of getting input varied with the different agencies. It appeared from review of documents that needs assessments for Weekend with the Experts are conducted at the conclusion of each session. The FIMCVH conducts a needs assessment at the conclusion of its annual teacher/volunteer state-wide conference. Some teachers reported they participated in needs assessments conducted by their school districts. Most people interviewed stated they completed a needs assessment conducted by their FDLRS center. None of the interviewees were aware of a state-wide needs assessment for inservice activities in the area of vision.

Five of the seven survey respondents from the residential school indicated they generally had input regarding inservice offerings. There seemed to be some confusion from the interviewees at FSDB regarding this question. They were not sure if they had completed a needs assessment or not.

Recommendations

1. Conduct an annual state-wide needs assessment for inservice topics. If only conference and workshop participants are surveyed others are not having input and may not attend future sessions. The FIMCVH could easily conduct the needs assessment using their newsletter. This would be an appropriate vehicle as it is distributed to professionals, parents, volunteers, etc.

2. The FIMCVH, the state vision consultant, FSDB, and FDLRS centers, should work more closely together regarding inservice training for professionals, parents, volunteers, etc. working with visually impaired students.

3. The state vision consultant and the FIMCVH director should serve on the advisory board to FDLRS centers so they can provide guidance in the area of inservice training for the visually impaired.

4. FSDB as a specialized FDLRS center, should take a more active role in inservice training for teachers of VI students in the state.

5. The inservice topics relevant to teachers of VI students should be addressed in the regional FDLRS needs assessments.

12. RELEVANT INSERVICE TRAINING IS OFFERED LOCALLY.

Results	Total	Teachers	All Others
too much	0 %	0 %	0 %
enough	31.8%	26.0%	44.0%
too little	46.1%	54.8%	28.0%
none	15.6%	19.2%	8.0%
N/A	1.9%	0 %	6.0%
D/K	4.5%	4.5%	14.0%

Analysis

Forty-six percent of the survey respondents thought there was too little inservice training relevant to vision offered locally; 32% thought there was enough; and 16% responded that no inservice was offered locally. There was a big discrepancy between ratings when teachers were grouped together and all other categories were grouped together. About 55% of the teachers felt that too little inservice was offered locally, while only 28% of nonteachers responded that too little inservice was offered locally. Twenty six percent of the

teachers felt there was enough inservice offered locally and 44% of of nonteachers felt that enough inservice was offered locally.

Generally, interviewees responded that too little or no relevant inservice was offered locally. Interviewees from two of the larger and metropolitan school districts, Hillsborough County and Dade County, indicated they had enough relevant inservice training offered at the local level. This coupled with the survey resuts may indicate that it is the teachers serving in rural areas, and smaller school districts who have fewer local inservice opportunities. It was unclear if all the inservice activities met new state guidelines for earning points for recertification -- workshops must be ten hours in length with a pretest and a posttest.

Six of the seven survey reponses from FSDB indicated they had enough relevant inservice offered locally. Interview responses from FSDB generally confirmed the survey responses.

Recommendations

1. FSBD should inform surrounding counties of their inservice training activities. A calendar of planned inservice activities could be shared through special newsletters, the Florida School Herald, and Special Net.

2. Counties within each FDLRS area should utilize the FDLRS newsletter to publicize any and all inservice training related to visual impairments. Often times a county may have only one or two vision teachers which makes it difficult to conduct special inservice activities designed for such a small number. Counties might take turns conducting workshops for low incidence populations.

3. Counties need to identify unique methods of inservice training for low incidence populations. For instance, packets of information and activities could be designed to increase skills in certain areas. Teachers could be encouraged to visit other programs and keep observational and evaluative notes. This would give them more of an awareness of what is being done in other programs.

13. RELEVANT INSERVICE TRAINING IS OFFERED REGIONALLY.

Results	Total	Teachers	All Others
none	1.9%	2.9%	0 %
too little	39.0%	44.2%	28.0%
enough	50.7%	51.0%	50.0%
too much	.6%	1.0%	0 %
N/A	1.9%	0 %	6.0%
D/K	5.8%	1.0%	16.0%

Analysis

Fifty-one percent of the survey respondents felt they had enough relevant inservice training offered on a regional basis. About 39% responded that too little inservice is offered regionally. Both teachers and nonteachers gave a high rate of response for having enough relevant inservice activities available on a regional basis. More teachers than nonteachers felt there was too little inservice training offered on a regional basis. It is interesting to note that LEA staff gave a much higher rate, (64%), than any other category of respondents, to "too little" inservice training offered on a regional basis. Eighty percent of the FDLRS respondents felt that enough inservice was offered on a regional basis.

Interview responses varied to this question. It seemed that some FDLRS Centers were very responsive to the needs of the teachers of VI students in their region and others were not as responsive. Often times FDLRS centers would help pay expenses for teachers of VI students to go to state inservice instead of offering inservice activities relevant to visual impairment at the regional level.

BEES conducted a series of regional workshops to inform teachers of new state rules and regulations regarding functional vision assessments and techniques for assessing functional vision. Not all of the interviewees had attended this workshop, and therefore they were uninformed. They all expressed a need to know the information, but had various reasons for not having attended the workshops.

Recommendations

1. FDLRS Centers should offer more inservice training at the regional level.

2. FDLRS should utilize professionals with expertice in visual impairments from local, state, and national levels. The faculty from FSU should be utilized, particularly in light of agreements between DOE and university programs to provide cost free inservice.

3. FDLRS Centers should, under the direction of a state level coordinating committee, offer regional inservice training to teachers in low incidence populations, e.g., divide the state into four regions: Northwest Florida, South Florida, Central Florida, and Northeast Florida. This would increase the number, encourage quality of inservice offerings, and increase attendance by reducing travel time for participants. Such an effort would require a coordinator and input from those qualified to serve low-incidence populations.

4. Special Education programs from each county should cooperate together and share inservice activities. County programs should share their inservice calendar with surrounding counties. FDLRS centers could be instrumental in communicating various inservice training opportunities avialable from local educational agencies in their regions.

5. Parents of visually impaired students and volunteers who work with visually impaired students should be informed of inservice training activities relevant to visual impairment. This could be done through newsletters or flyers sent home from school with the students.

6. There should be more one day meetings across the state. These inservice activities could be conducted by either FDLRS centers on a cooperative basis, BEES, FSDB, and FIMCVH.

14. RELEVANT INSERVICE IS OFFERED ON A STATE-WIDE BASIS.

Results	Total	Teachers	All Others
none	1.3%	1.9%	0 %
too little	26.0%	28.9%	20.0%
enough	62.3%	64.4%	58.0%
too much	.6%	0 %	2.0%
N/A	1.9%	0 %	6.0%
D/K	7.8%	4.8%	14.0%

Analysis

A majority (62%) of the survey respondents felt that enough relevant inservice training was offered on a state-wide basis. Twenty-six percent felt that too little inservice was offered at the state level. Nearly 29% of the teachers felt that too little inservice was offered at the state level, while 20% of the nonteachers felt there was too little inservice at the state level.

Generally, interviewees responded that there was enough inservice offered on a state-wide basis. Some interviewees, especially those from smaller counties, responded that the inservice offered at the state level was the only inservice relevant to visual impairment

available to them. Interviewees were very positive about the quality of the inservice offered at the state level.A number of different agencies contribute inservice opportunities at the state level as outlined in the introduction to this section.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Vary the location of state-level inservice activities, e.g., northwest, northeast, central, and south regions of the state.

2. Continue to offer Weekend with the Experts. Everyone was very positive about the quality and the variety of these inservice activities. Consider offering a portion of Weekends with the Experts during the summer.
The Weekend with the Experts has gained national recognition among those working in the field of visual impairments.

3. Conduct a state-wide needs assessment to obtain relevant topics for future inservice activities.

4. Improve timeliness and coverage of inservice announcement distribution.

15. YOUR SCHOOL DISTRICT OR AGENCY GIVES YOU RELEASE TIME TO ATTEND TRAINING ACTIVITIES RELEVANT TO VISION.

Results	Total	Teachers	All Others
always	31.2%	29.8%	34.0%
generally	47.4%	50.0%	42.0%
rarely	11.7%	16.4%	2.0%
never	1.3%	1.0%	2.0%
N/A	3.9%	1.0%	10.0%
D/K	4.5%	1.9%	10.0%

Analysis

About 47% of the survey respondents felt they generally received release time to attend inservice activities and about 31% felt they always received release time. A higher number of nonteachers than teachers felt they always received release time to attend inservice activities. A higher percentage of teachers than nonteachers felt they rarely received release time. About 43% of the respondents from the FIMCVH staff felt they always received release time. Almost all of the LEA staff and other staff who responded to the survey felt they always or generally received release time. Teachers from the residential school felt they were generally or always allowed release

time.

Interview responses greatly varied to this question. Some teachers felt they would receive release time for whatever inservice time they requested; others said they could attend training only if their principal/supervisor could get a substitute, and often times they could not. The amount of release time varied with school districts and often there was no formal policy for the number of days a teacher could be released. Interviewees from the FSDB generally felt they would receive release time as needed.

Recommendations

1. LEAs and FDLRS Centers should increase their budget to include substitute pay to cover release time for vision teachers to attend inservice training. This is already being done through some FDLRS Centers. This should be state policy and consistent across all 18 FDLRS centers.

2. School districts should be informed of the special needs caused by a low incidence population so they can make special concessions for teachers working in these areas. They may not be able to offer special inservice activities for one or two teachers, but they might pay for substitutes so their teachers can travel to another district to attend relevant inservice activities, or arrange for teachers' classes to be covered by supervisors or other appropriate personnel.

16. YOU ARE REIMBURSED FOR EXPENSES INCURRED DURING TRAVEL TO AND FROM INSERVICE.

Results

	Total	Teachers	All Others
always	28.6%	20.2%	46.0%
generally	39.6%	44.2%	30.0%
rarely	15.6%	21.2%	4.0%
never	7.1%	10.6%	0 %
N/A	3.9%	1.0%	10.0%
D/K	5.2%	2.9%	10.0%

Analysis

About 40% of all respondents stated that generally they were reimbursed for travel to inservice activities, and 29% stated they were always reimbursed. Responses were slightly different when comparing teachers to nonteachers. When data for all of the teachers were grouped and analyzed, 20% felt they were always reimbursed, 45% were generally reimbursed, about 21% were rarely reimbursed, and 11% were never reimbursed. Nonteachers responded as follows: 46% always, 30% generally, and 4% rarely. LEA staff, FDLRS staff, and DBS staff had the highest percentages for always receiving reimbursements during travel to/from inservice activities.

Interview responses varied with this question. Some teachers were always reimbursed, some were reimbursed some of the time, and some were never reimbursed. Some teachers said they were provided with partial reimbursement.

Recommendations

1. School districts and FDLRS Centers should make needed concessions for teachers working with low incidence populations, e.g., help pay expenses incurred during travel to distant inservice activities, especially when opportunities are not available locally and regionally.

2. FDLRS Centers should help coordinate travel activities so that teachers from different counties might travel and/or room together for distant inservice activities.

17. WEEKEND INSERVICE TRAINING ACTIVITIES ARE CONVENIENT.

Results

	Total	Teachers	All Others
never	12.3%	13.5%	10.0%
rarely	35.1%	36.5%	32.0%
generally	40.3%	43.3%	34.0%
always	2.6%	2.9%	2.0%
N/A	4.5%	1.0%	12.0%
D/K	5.2%	2.9%	10.0%

Analysis

This question received a wide spread in responses. Forty percent of all respondents felt that weekend inservice activities were generally convenient; 35% felt they were rarely convenient; and 3% felt they were always convenient. The responses followed the same general pattern when the teachers were grouped into a category and nonteachers were grouped together. About 43% of the residential school teachers felt that weekend inservice activities were never convenient.

There was a discrepancy between survey responses and interview responses. Most interviewees felt that weekend inservice activities were rarely convenient. Travel distance, required to attend inservices seemed to be a major deterant to attending. Many of the teachers said the workshops were excellent but they were unable to attend because of distance, time limitations, and infringement on personal time.

Recommendations

1. The geographic site of Weekend with the Experts should be moved about the state. This in-service should rotate the sites to afford all teachers an equal opportunity to participate.

2. Survey the teachers and see if it would be more convenient to offer some inservice for college credit during the summer, as well as during the school year, e.g. Weekend with the Experts. If so, FSDB might be a convenient location, especially if the school could offer room and board for a nominal fee.

18. YOU RECEIVE INFORMATION REGARDING RELEVANT INSERVICE TRAINING.

Results

	Total	Teachers	All Others
always	27.9%	27.9%	28.0%
generally	54.6%	57.7%	48.0%
rarely	9.7%	10.6%	8.0%
never	1.9%	2.9%	0 %
N/A	3.2%	0 %	10.0%
D/K	2.6%	1.0%	6.0%

Analysis

About 55% of all respondents felt they generally received relevant information regarding inservice training, and 28% felt they always received relevant information. About 10% felt they rarely received information. Survey results followed the same general patterns when teachers were grouped into a category and all other respondents were grouped together. Seventy percent of the FDLRS staff that responded to the survey felt they always receive information and the other 30% felt they generally received relevant information.

There are a number of vehicles for communicating with teachers of VI students in the state. Teachers of VI students received some newsletters directly, e.g., The Visual Field from the FIMCVH, the

monthly FDLRS newsletter, and direct mailings from the state vision consultant at BEES. Other newsletters and information updates are sent to administrators in the LEAs, e.g., Technical Assistance Reports from BEES and The Florida School Herald from FSDB.

Interview responses depicted a number of problems with communication regarding information relevant to inservice training. The information is not always included in the newsletters that the teachers received directly, administrators do not always pass information on to teachers, and teachers do not always attend to information presented to them.

Most of the interviewees were aware of and used the toll free number at the FIMCVH. They all felt that the state vision consultant and the staff at the FIMCVH were very accessible and helpful.

Most interviewees were not aware of inservice training opportunities available through FSDB. FSDB has recently received a grant from the state to develop materials for use with microcomputers and to conduct inservice training for vision teachers across the state. Two of the teachers from the Tampa area were aware of a recent microcomputer workshop conducted by FSDB, but none of the Miami teachers mentioned it. Both teachers stated they received the information from their FDLRS center. However, the state vision consultant was not informed of the workshop in advance which prevented timely statewide announcements to teachers of VI students.

Recommendations

1. A concerted effort should be made by the state to identify all communication sources available to teachers of VI students and establish a system for networking information. There seems to be some networking now, but it seems that some resources are not always sharing information in a timely manner.

2. A manual should be prepared for teachers serving low-incidence populations informing them of resources, materials, and helpful hints for performing their jobs. This manual should be routinely revised and distributed through DOE, BEES.

19. THE COORDINATION AMONG AGENCIES REGARDING INSERVICE ACTIVITIES IS ADEQUATE.

Results

	Total	Teachers	All Others
never	1.9%	1.9%	2.0%
rarely	22.7%	23.1%	22.0%
generally	52.6%	54.8%	48.0%
always	7.8%	6.7%	10.0%
N/A	1.9%	0 %	6.0%
D/K	13.0%	13.5%	12.0%

Analysis

About 53% of all respondents indicated they agreed that coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities is generally adequate and 8% felt that coordination was always adequate. Nearly 23% felt that coordination was rarely adequate. Percentages were consistent when respondents were separated into two groups of teachers and all others.

Interview responses were consistent with survey results. Teachers responded that coordination and communication was very good with BEES and FIMCVH. Interviewees indicated a need for better

communication and coordination between FSDB, and other agencies, e.g., BEES, FIMCVH, DBS and FDLRS. Not many of the interviewees were aware that FSDB serves as a specialized FDLRS Center with a mandate to help with assessment, materials, and inservice training across the state. The administration at FSDB recognized they are a specialized FDLRS Center but commented that they lack the funding to implement the mandate.

FSDB has recently received a grant to implement inservice training activities with teachers of VI students in the state relevant to using microcomputers and access technology. The school has plans to establish a microcomputer laboratory, both to use with teachers and students. FSDB held its first computer workshop for vision teachers in the spring. They informed the various FDLRS centers, who in turn informed the teachers of VI students in the districts. There were no data provided to determine if the communication was done in a timely manner.

Interviewees voiced a number of concerns regarding the Vision Program at FSU. Assessibility to FSU's programs is limited as long as courses are only offered on the main campus. Teachers are often unable to travel the distance to take courses at FSU. BEES data suggests that there is a shortage of certified teachers of VI students in the state. This study alone indicates that 26 (17%) of the teachers responding to the survey are not certified in the areas of

visual impairments. Interviewees stated that FSU needs to continue to heighten its recruitment efforts for the vision program. There was stated concern regarding the content and responsiveness to the current and ever changing needs of the field. There was also very little evidence that FSU is involved in providing inservice training around the state although they are offering some on campus.

A telephone conversation with Dr. Gideon Jones, Director of the Personnel Preparation Program for Teacher Education in Visual Disabilities at FSU, provided a different perspective. Dr. Jones stated that all universities are mandated to provide on request, a certain amount of inservice training at no charge to LEAs and FDLRS centers. He stated they did not receive many requests; and that all requests had been honored. FSU has not received requests to offer off-campus courses in the field of vision. One administrator verbally requested courses be offered but has not followed up with the necessary paper work to formalize the request.

Dr. Jones stated that FSU has implemented a large recruiment effort. A person employed by FSU has been designated as a recruitment specialist. She travels to community colleges in the state and informs students about the education program at FSU and specifically the vision program. The FSU vision program disseminates pencils with a printed advertisement about the vision program. Dr. Jones stated that graduate enrollment is up at FSU but undergraduate enrollment is

down. Currently, there are stipends available at the graduate level to help with expenses, but not at the undergraduate level. It should be noted that recruitment of personnel into the field of blindness is a national problem due to nation-wide low enrollments. FSU has made recent an conserted efforts to increase enrollments in the vision program.

The recent RAISE Bill passed by the Florida Legislature will have an impact on inservice training for teachers of the visually impaired. Students are required to take more science and math courses. Teachers of VI students will need to offer technical assistance and knowledge to regular education teachers so VI students can be successful in their studies.

Recommendations

1. A concerted effort should be made to coordinate inservice activities relevant to visual impairment provided by the various agencies in the state. Each agency should share preliminary plans and dates for inservice activities for the year and publicize the calendar in their newsletter. Newsletters should be disseminated to every agency that deals with visually impaired students.

2. Develop and distribute a bi-annual calendar of intended inservice activities, planned or offered by, BEES, FIMCVH, FSDB, DBS, and FDLRS.

3. FSDB should hire a qualified person to serve as the trainer for the inservice activities provided by the microcomputer grant. The person should be certified in vision, experienced with visually impaired students, and knowledgeable and competent with microcomputers and access technology.

4. FSDB should activitely implement the inservice component of the microcomputer grant. The school could and should serve as a catalyst to establish appropriate computer education programs and

serve as a demonstration site for VI students throughout the state.

5. FSU should take a more agressive role in broadening their outreach program, e.g., offer certification programs across the state. They should offer a certification program on campus during the summer.

6. FSU should continue to expand their recruitment efforts.

7. FSU should continue to update their course offerings using direct service providers input. An advisory committee should be formed and utilized (as recommended in the Florida State Plan). It should include teachers, administrators, and consumers from the state, and if possible national leaders from the field.

8. FSU should attempt to procure stipends for both undergraduate and part-time student support as it is now possible to apply for these through OSERS Personnel Preparation grants.

9. LEAs and FDLRS centers should be informed of the process and strongly encourage to request inservice training and off-campus coursework from FSU. They should be provided with a written description of the process, copies of needed forms, and all the necessary names and addresses of people involved.

10. Incentives should be offered to regular education teachers to become certified in vision. This could be done though tuition waivers and stipends offered by BEES or LEAs to help defray the expenses.

20. REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHERS ARE ADEQUATELY PROVIDED WITH INSERVICE TRAINING REGARDING THE NEEDS OF VISUALLY IMPAIRED STUDENTS.

Results

	Total	Teachers	All Others
always	3.9%	2.9%	6.0%
generally	20.1%	19.2%	22.0%
rarely	44.2%	51.0%	30.0%
never	14.3%	20.2%	2.0%
N/A	5.8%	1.0%	16.0%
D/K	11.7%	5.8%	24.0%

Analysis

Over 59% of the respondents indicated that regular education teachers are rarely or never adequately provided with inservice training regarding the needs of visually impaired students. About 20% indicated regular education teachers were generally provided with adequate inservice training and only 4% indicated they felt that regular education teachers were always provided with inservice training relative to visual impairment. The teachers seemed to be more negative about this question than the other respondents. Fifty one percent of the teachers felt that regular education teachers rarely received inservice relative to VI and 20% felt they never received

inservice; 30% of all others felt that regular education teachers rarely received inservice; and only 2% felt they never received inservice.

Interview responses also indicated that regular education teachers are rarely, if ever adequately provided with inservice training regarding the needs of visually impaired students. Interviewees cited instances where regular education teachers may have attended a single workshop or activity, but none of the systems had a plan for providing regular educators with inservice regarding visually impaired students. Inservicing of regular education teachers was stated to be provided by individual vision teachers, as they saw the need. Most of the interviewees felt it was important to offer inservice training to regular educators; but very few responded that they had made efforts to offer inservice themselves.

Regular education teachers were interviewed and stated that it was very important for vision teachers and related professionals to offer inservice training activities relevant to the needs of visually impaired students to regular education teachers. A need was expressed to offer incentives to regular education teachers so they would attend such inservice training.

Recommendations

1. Teachers of VI students should receive both pre and inservice training in developing and presenting meaningful inservice training to regular education (parents, paraprofessionals, administrators, etc).

2. Vision teachers should be encouraged to offer inservice training to regular education teachers. A special packet of guidelines, including examples of various LEA procedures for implementation, activities and relevant information might be developed by BEES in cooperation with a committee of teachers, administrators, FSU, FIMC, etc.

3. A variety of techniques should be used to present inservice activities to regular education teachers, e.g., video tapes might be made by professionals in the field with activities and relevant information. Special relevant conference presentations might be video-taped for presentation to regular education teachers.

4. Existing relevant inservice materials, programs, and packages should be identified, and made available for training. These materials should be housed at a statewide distribution facility such

as FIMCVH or Clearinghouse.

5. Regular education teachers should be provided with relevant literature from the field of vision. A committee could identify best articles and publications for dissemination or develop materials to be disseminated to regular education teachers.

6. Teachers of VI students should present each classroom teacher with whom they have a visually impaired child placed, with a specific description of the child's visual problem, the educational implications of the vision problem, and the special needs of the student. The description should include adaptations required for the specific student.

7. Teachers of VI students should inform FSU of regular education teachers who show special interest in the field so that FSU might recruit more teachers for the field.

V Assessment Results

Introduction

Administrators of programs for visually impaired students are mandated by a variety of laws to make periodic assessments of different components of their programs. P.L. 94-142 and state regulations require that: students receive assessments in order to determine present levels of functioning; administrators must routinely assess the effectiveness of teachers of visually impaired students; and, with the advent of new technology and a new body of knowledge regarding the visually impaired students' access to technology, educators must assess each student's potential to benefit from available equipment, e.g. optical aids, computers.

Section 6A-6.3014 of the Resource Manual for the Development and Evaluation of Special Programs for Exceptional Students: Vol. 1B Florida Statutes and State Board of Education Rules... (January 1984) states that visually impaired students who receive special education services receive, "an evaluation of developmental or academic

functioning, daily living skills, mode of reading, and, if appropriate vocational and orientation and mobility skills." The BEES regulations also list the criteria for visually impaired students to be eligible for special education services. In addition to meeting medical criteria, the student must have an educational report which documents "a functional vision loss which 1) inhibits normal processing of information through the visual channel; and, 2) requires the use of specialized techniques, textbooks, materials, or equipment." Teachers and administrators who were interviewed often refer to this assessment of functional vision as an LVO or low vision observation. For those students who are without the sense of sight, a statement is made regarding the student's need to learn through other senses.

Assessments cannot be made in isolation. Based on the data from assessments, educational decisions should be made to facilitate growth in academics and the development of independent abilities in the students for whom the educational system is established.

21. THE INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING ASSESSMENTS ARE QUALIFIED TO ASSESS VISUALLY IMPAIRED STUDENTS.

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	always	14.3%	9.8%	23.1%
	generally	48.7%	51.0%	44.2%
	rarely	22.7%	28.4%	11.5%
	never	2.6%	3.9%	0 %
	N/A	2.6%	0	7.7%
	D/K	9.1%	6.9%	13.5%

Analysis

While 14% of all respondents believe that those assessing visually impaired students are always qualified to perform the assessments, only 10% of the teachers believe this to be true and 23% of nonteachers believe it to be true. Thirty-two percent of all the responding teachers believed assessments are rarely or never performed by qualified individuals while 12% of the nonteachers reported that assessments are carried out by those without qualifications. It should be pointed out that 7% of the teachers and 21% of the nonteachers responded by indicating D/K or N/A to this question.

A greater percentage of the teachers without certification to teach visually impaired students and those respondents who were not teachers reported that those who assess the students are more qualified to do so. In other words, teachers with certification were less inclined to feel that assessments were being performed by qualified personnel. Approximately 25% of all the respondents felt that students are rarely or never assessed by qualified personnel.

Transcripts from interviews indicated that locating and or/assuring that qualified professionals will perform assessments for visually impaired students was sometimes a problem. In some school districts teachers were very satisfied with the assessment procedures, the helpfulness of a FDLRS center, etc. On other occasions, teachers and principals reported concern that those assessing students were not qualified to perform assessments and that in many cases certified teachers of the visually impaired were available but not consulted. This seemed to be a particular concern with assessments for multiply impaired and low functioning students; within this category, a further concern which emerged was for assessments in vocational areas. In one center, for example, assessments were performed by psychologists and educators prior to placement in a program for "TMR" students. It was also learned that two educational diagnostitians who were interviewed were assessing students without certification in the education of visually impaired students.

A great disparity seemed to emerge regarding approaches to assessment for mode of reading. While some students were assured a clinical low vision assessment as a part of their assessment for educational programming, others reported that closed circuit televisions and large type books were automatically provided as the mode of reading for students who have low vision.

Recommendations

1. The state of Florida should consider a series of workshops for those who assess visually handicapped students, particularly for those who do not have certification in the education of the visually impaired, and for those who are assessing viusally impaired students who are "low functioning" due to mental retardation or other sensory or physical disabilities.

2. The state of Florida should consider establishing guidelines regarding the minimal qualifications of those who perform assessments for visually impaired learners, particularly in those areas established by the state, i.e. developmental or academic functioning, daily living skills, mode of reading, (and if appropriate) vocational, orientation and mobility skills.

3. Detailed state guidelines should be established regarding low vision observations (LVOs).

4. A clinical low vision evaluation should be secured for all students for whom it is appropriate as indicated by the teacher administered LVO.

5. The state of Florida should include study/coursework in assessment of visually impaired students in its certification requirements.

6. FSU and other university programs offering courses in visual impairments should review course content/offerings in overall assessment for visually impaired students. Additions and modifications should be made as necessary.

22. APPROPRIATE RESOURCES AND INSTRUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE TO ASSESS VISUALLY IMPAIRED STUDENTS.

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	Never	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%
	Rarely	21.4%	29.4%	5.8%
	Generally	47.8%	46.1%	48.1%
	Always	14.9%	13.7%	17.3%
	N/A	3.2%	0 %	9.6%
	D/K	9.7%	6.9%	15.4%

Analysis

Sixty-three percent of all respondents felt that appropriate instruments are generally or always available to assess visually impaired students. Approximately equal percentages of teachers (60%) and nonteachers (65%) reported that resources and instruments for assessing visually impaired students were generally or always available.

While 25% of the respondents felt that appropriate resources and instruments are never or rarely available to assess visually impaired students, this number represents 32% of the teachers and only 10% of

the nonteachers; more of the certified teachers felt this way than noncertified teachers.

Thirteen percent of all respondents felt that they could not respond to this question. This includes nearly 7% of all teachers who were not knowledgeable about whether appropriate resources and instruments were available for assessing visually impaired students.

Interviews confirmed these findings. Assessment resources and intruments were available to many of those interviewed but others did not feel that they could obtain appropriate instruments. This concern was strongly expressed for those needing to serve multiply impaired students. Checklists and other instruments are used for assessment procedures; however, these procedures seem to vary according to the knowledge base of the teacher involved.

Some teachers seemed to be aware of many instruments to assess visually impaired students. Others were not aware of projects which were originated, published and readily available within the state, e.g. Project IVEY. In a booklet prepared by the FSDB, Assessment Tools for Sensory Impaired Individuals , only four instruments are listed which would be appropriate for teachers to administer; two of these instruments could be used for educational assessments.

LEA teachers and principals seemed to have conflicting or no

information about the assessments which could be carried out through the Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind. There were inconsistencies among interviewers regarding the involvement of FDLRS centers in assessment of VI students. The FIMCVH was often noted by those interviewed as a very receptive and efficient resource for the provision of large type or braille assessments and standardized tests--when available.

Vocational assessments and assessments for technology were two areas frequently mentioned as being in need of instrument development. In addition, personal intuition or unwritten district policy seemed to be the leading approach to determining whether low vision students receive clinical visual evaluations prior to an assessment for the mode of reading.

Recommendations

1. A library of assessment instruments should become available for each of the areas in which the state of Florida requires assessments. The logical placement for this library is the FIMCVH because the service can be most efficiently provided at a state level due to the relatively low frequency of use.

2. A listing of recommended assessment instruments for visually impaired students should be made available to all school districts and to FSDB. This list should include resources for formal, informal, standardized and nonstandardized assessments.

3. A planned, and developmental series of workshops, rather than isolated presentations, should be made available to teachers of VI students.

4. A brochure describing the diagnostic services which are available at the FSDB should be developed and made available to school districts throughout the state.

23. ASSESSMENT DATA ARE A BASIS FOR EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENT DECISIONS.

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	Never	.6%	0 %	1.9%
	Rarely	11.7%	16.7%	1.9%
	Generally	48.7%	54.9%	36.5%
	Always	27.3%	22.6%	36.5%
	N/A	3.9%	1.0%	9.6%
	D/K	7.8%	4.9%	13.5%

Analysis

Although very few of the respondents felt that placement decisions are rarely made on the basis of assessment data, 17% of the teachers felt that assessment data were rarely used to place students. Only 2% of the nonteachers felt this to be true and certified teachers were more likely to respond with "rarely" than were noncertified teachers. Seventy-six percent of all respondents felt that assessment data were generally or always used to make placement decisions. These data do not imply that placement decisions are based on a service delivery model which contains all service options; students may be placed in a limited number of options. Nearly 6% of the teachers and 23% of the nonteachers felt they were not knowledgeable about such placement

decisions.

Again, interview data confirmed these results. While a majority of those interviewed considered placement decisions to be based on assessment data, others believed that either placement decisions were made without regard to assessment data or with a limited number of options. A rural teacher stated all her students are placed in a resource program because "that's where all the equipment is located". In larger school districts, more options seem to be available and the concept of "least restrictive environment" appears to be the guiding factor based on assessment data. This comment should be tempered with the fact that some districts did report that they utilized the services of the FSDB when they did not have an appropriate placement for their students. A review of existing materials, specifically indicates that the present statewide practice encourages the resource rather than the itinerant model.

It is important to note that nearly one in four of all respondents felt that placement decisions were made on the basis of factors other than a student's assessments. An assumption is being made that decisions are or are not based on data which professionals believe to be reflective of a student's present level of functioning. When examining the data from question 22, one may determine that because appropriate resources and assessment instruments may not be available to many districts placement decisions are based on

professional opinion. The limited number of placement options in some districts should be of concern, particularly since a student's assessment data may indicate that the student would receive an appropriate education in an unavailable placement.

Recommendations

1. The state of Florida should consider a study to examine the processes being used for placement decisions for visually impaired students. Factors such as the availability of LEA options, assessment data, qualifications of assessors, etc. should be examined. Transcripts of IEP meetings may be useful for such a study.

2. The concept of "least restrictive environment" could be the focus of parents and teachers' workshops.

3. The concept of a "successful" placement should be defined by DOE, BEES, not only for the administrative concerns but also for the students who are so placed.

24. ASSESSMENT DATA ARE THE BASIS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF IEPS.

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	Never	1.3%	2.0%	0 %
	Rarely	7.1%	7.8%	5.8%
	Generally	50.7%	64.8%	23.1%
	Always	32.5%	25.5%	46.2%
	N/A	3.2%	0 %	9.7%
	D/K	5.2%	0 %	15.4%

Analysis

Eighty-three percent of the respondents felt that assessment data were generally or always the basis for IEPs. A higher percentage, 90% of the teachers felt that IEPs were developed with assessment data as a basis. All teachers responded to this questions implying a great involvement in the IEP process. Still, 10% of the teachers felt that IEPs were rarely or never developed using assessment data.

In reviewing IEPs provided by the FIMCVH staff as representative of IEPs across the state, there seemed to be a great discrepancy in the quality and quantity of content. For example, on an IEP for a seventh grader, academic level of functioning was listed as

"acceptable for grade level" while later on the form it was noted that this student's scores for math and science were more than one year below grade level. Interviewers revealed that the role of the teacher of VI students needs to be clarified, as they are sometimes viewed and utilized as tutors rather than specified teachers knowledgeable in the unique needs of VI students.

Many respondents felt that assessment data were the basis for the development of IEPs for individual students. The quality of content on the IEPs, however, does not seem to be the same accross the state. While the investigator is aware that each school district has set policies for IEPs, the instructional program should emerge from individualized goals set for each student. The extent to which the IEPs become an integral part of the instructional program is not known.

From the reviewed data, professionals seem to utilize assessment data for developing the IEP. Since assessment data are, by law, part of the IEP, it is not known if respondents reflected this mandate by indicating that the information was contained in the IEP document or that short and long term goals for each student emerge from existing knowledge about the student.

Recommendations

1. Workshops should incorporate the application of assessment data into IEP development. For example, a workshop on functional vision assessments should include a demonstration of how this information should be used to establish IEP goals.

2. Vehicles should be developed by which teachers who serve students with similar functioning levels can share information. The use of assessment data for low functioning students, for example, may be used in workshops, newsletters etc.

3. BEES staff should communicate with administrators of programs who serve visually impaired students to clarify the role of the teacher of the visually handicapped. An administrator's workshop on meeting the needs of visually impaired students in their district may be beneficial.

4. Communication systems already in place should include updated information not only listing assessment tools which become available, and where they can be obtained, but also provide descriptions, reviews, and potential applications.

25. SPECIALIZED ASSESSMENTS BY ANCILLARY PERSONNEL ARE AVAILABLE (LOW VISION, OT)

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	Always	18.2%	16.7%	21.2%
	Generally	56.5%	61.8%	46.2%
	Rarely	14.3%	16.7%	9.6%
	Never	1.9%	2.9%	0 %
	N/A	3.2%	1.0%	7.7%
	D/K	5.8%	1.0%	15.4%

Analysis

Seventy-five percent of all respondents felt that specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are made available to visually impaired students. A slightly higher percentage (78.5%) of the teachers agreed with this statement. Twenty percent of the teachers felt that such evaluations were rarely or never available; this included only 3% of the teachers who were never able to obtain such assessments for VI students. Since 23% of the nonteachers and only 2% of the teachers felt they were not able to answer this question, it appears that teachers were far more informed about specialized assessments than those in other professional roles.

It was generally felt that those interviewed were aware of how and where to obtain such assessments for students who could benefit from them. Orientation and mobility assessments were mentioned frequently; those districts which did not employ their own O&M instructors, were able to obtain assessments on a contract or other basis. It is not known how many of the students who receive assessments in which it is deemed appropriate that they receive O&M instruction, are able to receive O&M instruction. Some of the administrators who were interviewed commented that they had one O&M instructor assigned to their district and they were interested in obtaining funding and recruiting another. Many school districts seem to have contracts with low vision clinics and students are receiving clinical evaluations; transportation was sometimes noted as a concern for these appointments. In a few districts, however, teachers appeared to be unaware of where and when such assessments should be made available to students; these teachers tended to utilize only those resources which were made available through their school district's staff. Specialized assessments by ancillary school personnel seem to be made available to students throughout the state. In some districts, however, inexperienced, and perhaps uncertified teachers, are unaware of which of these assessment procedures should be made available to their students.

Recommendations

1. A set of guidelines should be established in regard to what types of assessments are appropriate for a child who has a visual or other handicap.

2. Sources of funding for assessments by qualified personnel should be the focus of information sent to school administrators. Such issues as third part payment for low vision aids and transportation concerns may be addressed as well as.

26. ASSESSMENTS ARE APPROPRIATE FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS OF VISUALLY IMPAIRED STUDENTS (GIFTED, BILINGUAL, MULTIPLY IMPAIRED, ETC.).

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	Never	3.3%	4.9%	0 %
	Rarely	28.6%	35.3%	15.4%
	Generally	47.4%	47.1%	48.1%
	Always	5.8%	2.9%	11.5%
	N/A	3.2%	0 %	9.6%
	D/K	11.7%	9.8%	15.4%

Analysis

Slightly more than half of the respondents (53%) reported that assessments for special populations of students were generally or always appropriate. This represented only 50% of the teachers and a slightly higher percentage of nonteachers. It was surprising that 10% of the teachers did not know if these assessments were appropriate. It is not known how many of this group were made up of noncertified teachers who are serving visually impaired students.

Most of those interviewed felt comfortable with assessment procedures for special populations among the visually impaired students, e.g. bilingual, gifted. The only group for which those

interviewed routinely commented about the need for more appropriate assessments were those who are multiply impaired. This positive impression from interviews was not confirmed with questionnaire responses. Special populations may be assessed, as are others with the same characteristics, with the teacher of the visually impaired providing input e.g. for assessing bilingual or gifted students.

Recommendations

1. A network system for ease of communication among teachers and those who assess multiply impaired students who are visually impaired should be established.

2. A library of assessment instruments and accepted procedures used with special populations of visually impaired students should be established and made available. For example, how might assessments for bilingual students be adapted for a blind child?

27. FORMAL AND INFORMAL ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS USED ARE APPROPRIATE IN THOSE AREAS REQUIRED BY THE STATE OF FLORIDA (MEDICAL, SOCIAL, FUNCTIONAL VISION).

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	Always	16.2%	12.8%	23.1%
	Generally	63.0%	71.6%	46.2%
	Rarely	8.4%	8.8%	7.7%
	Never	0 %	0 %	0 %
	N/A	2.6%	0 %	7.7%
	D/K	9.7%	6.9%	15.4%

Analysis

Seventy-nine percent of all respondents and 84% of the teachers felt that assessments in those areas specified by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision etc.) are appropriate. Nine percent and 8% of the teachers and nonteachers respectively, felt that they were rarely appropriate and none of the respondents felt that they were never appropriate. It is not known whether specific types of assessments, e.g., vocational, would routinely be considered more or less appropriate.

The questionnaire data, in this instance, appeared to be more positive than the responses of those who were interviewed. While some professionals were very pleased with the assessment procedures in all required areas, others felt that areas such as mode of reading and daily living skills were areas in which there was a lack of guidance or standards. Vocational education was mentioned by several individuals, particularly for those students who are not college bound. All of those interviewed were pleased with assessments for orientation and mobility, however it must be noted that they were not specialists or trained O&M trainers.

Recommendations

1. A set of guidelines should be established for each of the areas required to be assessed by the state of Florida. In addition, a listing of recommended procedures should be made available for teachers. The assessment list developed by FSDB may prove to be a useful resource for such a document.

2. A series of workshops should be made available on topics related to assessment in each of the areas stated above. Parents may also benefit from receiving information regarding the appropriateness and interpretation and application of assessment data.

28. FORMAL AND INFORMAL ASSESSMENTS USED ARE APPROPRIATE IN SPECIAL SKILLS AREAS (TECHNOLOGY, UTILIZATION OF LOW VISION, ETC.).

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	Never	0 %	0 %	0 %
	Rarely	14.3%	19.6%	3.8%
	Generally	59.1%	61.8%	53.9%
	Always	7.8%	4.9%	13.5%
	N/A	3.9%	2.0%	7.7%
	D/K	14.9%	11.8%	21.2%

Analysis

Sixty-seven percent of the respondents felt that assessment procedures in special skills areas were generally or always appropriate. The same percentage of the teachers felt this way. None of the respondents reported that these assessments are never appropriate.

In this data, it was surprising to note that nearly 20% of the teachers felt these assessments were rarely appropriate and an additional 14% did not know whether or not these assessments were appropriate. Thus, over one third of the teachers either could not

respond or negatively responded to this question.

Interviews corroborated these findings. However, many teachers noted that they were unsure of their academic preparation for giving assessments. One possible reason for this is that with the advent of new technology and increased expectations of teachers, e.g., working with students in areas such use of computers, optical aids, and special needs of multi-handicapped students, etc., teachers may feel the need to update their assessment and instructional skills. A few of the interviewed teachers reported that they were not aware of some of the projects which were initiated and carried out through the state of Florida e.g., on computers, Project IVEY, etc..

Recommendations

1. Additional information should be disseminated to all teachers throughout the state in regard to assessments in special skills areas. Which students should receive such assessments also should be stipulated.

2. The differences and relationships between assessment procedures and instructional strategies should be emphasized in inservice presentations.

3. Those teachers who are serving visually impaired students, who are responsible for assessments, and who identify themselves as being unsure of their abilities to assess students in special skills areas, should receive encouragement to return to school or receive such instruction in other ways.

29. PROFESSIONALS, PARENTS, AND STUDENTS HAVE OPPORTUNITIES TO EVALUATE DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM FOR VISUALLY IMPAIRED STUDENTS (CURRICULUM, ETC.).

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	Never	3.9%	4.9%	1.9%
	Rarely	27.3%	33.3%	15.4%
	Generally	41.6%	44.1%	36.5%
	Always	14.3%	11.8%	19.2%
	N/A	2.6%	0 %	7.7%
	D/K	10.4%	5.9%	19.2%

Analysis

Fifty-six percent of those who responded felt that parents, professionals and students have opportunities to evaluate different aspects of programs for the VI students. Since 27% of the nonteachers said they could not respond to the question, this figure of 56% may underestimate the true number of individuals who have this opinion and who have direct access to programs. One third of the teachers did report that they rarely felt that they had this access.

Interviews seemed to offer more positive information than the questionnaire data indicated. Those who were asked questions

concerning this issue seemed pleased with their ability to offer input to teachers, administrators, etc. regarding programs for visually impaired students. Parents felt that they could call upon educators at any time. Educators seemed generally pleased but a few stated that they sometimes were frustrated with services they could not change, e.g., adding more service delivery options to a local school district.

Recommendations

1. Efforts made thus far toward encouraging opportunities for profesessionals, parents and students to evaluate program aspects should be continued as they have apparently been successeful.

30. THE SKILLS OF PROFESSIONALS ARE EVALUATED BY PERSONS KNOWLEDGEABLE IN THE AREA OF VISUAL IMPAIRMENTS.

		Total	Teacher	All Others
Results	Always	10.4%	7.8%	5.8%
	Generally	33.1%	27.5%	1.2%
	Rarely	27.9%	36.3%	30.8%
	Never	18.8%	26.5%	3.8%
	N/A	2.6%	1.0%	15.4%
	D/K	7.1%	1.0%	23.1%

Analysis

Only 44% of the respondents felt that the skills of professionals who serve visually impaired students are generally or always evaluated by those knowledgeable about the education of visually impaired students. A lower percentage, 35% of the teachers felt this to be true, and more than one in four teachers felt that they were never evaluated by those knowledgeable about visual handicaps. Thirty-nine percent of nonteachers felt they could not answer this question.

This is often a problem with low incidence areas for which one or a few teachers may be hired by a school district. In one such district

a state-level person was asked to spend a day with the teacher and the teacher's supervisor. This approach to evaluation was highly appreciated by the teacher who felt that not only was she given an appropriate evaluation, but she benefited from the interaction with someone who could offer specific suggestions related to visual disabilities and her program.

One principal commented that his concerns in evaluating teachers of visually impaired children were; he was not knowledgeable about the education of visually impaired students and therefore could not offer recommendations specific to the disability, and because the state of Florida does not require teachers of the visually impaired to receive a regular education certificate, they were not to be accountable for certain pedagogical skills. The fact that there are benefits to being evaluated by a supervisor who is knowledgeable about one's discipline is assumed. However, a significant number of the teachers (63%) felt that they were rarely or never evaluated by such individuals. While some school districts were innovative in obtaining appropriate evaluations for their specialized teachers, others require evaluations of teachers by those who are not knowledgeable about the field. It is understood that this is a problem for low incidence areas of exceptionality, and particularly in rural areas; it is not a problem unique to the state of Florida.

Recommendations

1. Training should be offered by the state for supervisors of teachers of visually impaired students. Innovative ideas and recommendations and should be shared with school districts who do not have evaluators who are knowledgeable about visual disabilities.

2. Since the state of Florida does not require teachers of the visually impaired to receive a regular education certificate, those who evaluate these teachers should either provide evaluations based on pedagogical skills obtained within coursework leading to certification, skills gained on the job, and be provided with opportunities to augment such skills.

VI Additional Recommendations

Limitations

Inherent in all research are limitations and this study is not an exception. The primary limitations of this study were: (1) both sets of interviews were conducted before survey results were returned, tabulated and analyzed; (2) the focus of the study was visually impaired students without a strong emphasis on multi-handicapped visually impaired students; and (3) it is not known if respondents answered the assessment section of the survey with an understanding of the limits imposed by the poor state-of-the-art in regard to available, valid, and reliable instruments for use with visually impaired students.

Recommendations

During the process of conducting this study the team made many observations, some of these have resulted in the identification of issues which are recommended for further study in the State of Florida but did not directly apply to survey questions. They are as follows:

- Career/vocational education needs and programs for visually impaired students.

- Transition needs, programs, and collaborative agreements among agencies serving the visually impaired in the state of Florida.

- The effects of Florida's funding formula on providing the most appropriate education programs in the "least restrictive" environments for visually impaired students. Through present funding formulas the resource room rather than itinerant model is encouraged. This may be impeding placement in the most appropriate and least restrictive environment.

- Survey data indicate 26 (17%) of teachers responding were not certified in the area of visual impairments. This should be an area of concern and discussion requiring immediate action.

- The number of qualified orientation and mobility instructors is inadequate to serve the visually impaired students in Florida.

This weakness should be corrected.

- Each FDLRS Center should maintain a qualified teacher of the visually impaired students (if possible also qualified in orientation and mobility) to provide direct and/or indirect services, e.g. consulting, assessment, inservice, instruction, etc.

Throughout the study it was evident that Florida has exemplary programs which are worthy of replication. However, the team was concerned that in some instances program success may be dependent on personality rather than established policies and procedures. Florida is fortunate to have such dedicated, knowledgeable, and skillful staff who take their professional responsibilities beyond written policy. The state of Florida is strongly encouraged to look at this situation and develop policies and procedures where needed, so that successful programs can continue to be developed, and maintained irregardless of inevitable personnel changes.

VII Summary Statement

The Florida Department of Education has developed, supported, and implemented exemplary programs which serve visually impaired students at the state, regional, and local level. Recommendations have been made throughout this report. It must be clearly understood that the implementation of these recommendations, and therefore the improvement of support services for visually impaired students, is totally dependent upon intra-agency collaboration. A mechanism must be devised and implemented to insure that collaboration goes beyond the written agreement and directly improves the support services to visually impaired students residing in the state. The existing state level steering committee may indeed be this mechanism, however additional agenies may need to be represented (e.g. FDLRS).

An alternative mechanism may be for the Department of Education to designate one of the specialized statewide FDLRS Centers as the principal coordinating unit for support services for visually impaired students. The results of this study strongly indicate that the most appropriate agency is the FIMCVH. This state level coordinating unit should have an advisory committee consising of representatives from associate and specialized FDLRS Centers, BEES, and DBS.

To insure parent and professional input each FDLRS associate center should have a Visually Impaired Task Force with membership to include parents, teachers, administrators and support staff. This task force would review and act on regional issues thereby guaranteeing support services,--materials, inservice, and assessment--for visually impaired students. Issues needing state-level action would be referred to the advisory committee of the state level coordinating unit.

VIII Acknowledgements

First and foremost, the AFB Study of Support Services Provided to Visually Impaired Students in the State of Florida team acknowledges Suzanne Dalton, FIMCVH for her indefatigable efforts on behalf of the project. Her organizational, coordinating, and other professional skills along with her hospitality, cordiality and sensitivity are to be commended.

Paul Lewis, FIMCVH, and Marie Kovesci, BEES are also to be recognized for their conceptualization and decision to implement the project. Both provided support and assistance throughout the project.

Appreciation is extended to all administrators, teachers, parents, students, volunteers, support personnel, and survey respondents for their cooperation, availability, and candor.

The staff of the American Foundation for the Blind involved in the project, some identified in the project proposal and some not, are extended the team's appreciation.

The team further extends its availability to the State of Florida as points of clarification may be needed or as strategies for the implementation of recommendations are developed.

REVIEW OF THE RECORDS: description of items

1) "State Policy for the Education of Exceptional Students in Florida, 1869-1979"

This dissertation traces the history of education services provided to exceptional students in Florida. State policy as influenced by the Florida Legislature, the Florida State Board of Education, the Florida Department of Education and other executive offices is outlined.

MATERIALS DELIVERY

2) Florida Statute 233.056

In 1972, the Florida Legislature authorized the Division of Public Schools of the Department of Education to establish FIMCVH. the statute describes Center activities and major purpose. A historical description of Statute 233.056 can be found in the dissertation listed above (pp. 88-89).

3) FIMCVH Project Application, 1984-85

Each year, Hillsborough County School Board is required to submit a project application highlighting proposed Center activities and budget summary to BEES for approval. The objective addressing the Support Services Study is highlighted on page 18. The project application is disseminated to BEES staff, FIMC staff and Hillsborough County administrative staff.

4) FIMCVH Annual Report, FY 1984

At the end of each fiscal year, BEES requires an annual report which summarized the Center activities. The annual reports are disseminated to BEES staff, FIMC staff, select AIRCVH members and Vision Steering Committee members.

5) FIMCVH appropriations analysis, 1972-84

Page one of the Biennial Budget Request compares the FY '85 budget with the FY '86 and FY '87 budgets. Page two isolates general revenue funding (state); while page three highlights EHA VI-B funding (federal). A historical analysis of appropriations appears on page four. Page five and page six highlight the proposed braille production center portion of the budgets. Dissemination: BEES staff and FIMC staff and the Coalition for Education of Exceptional Students (lobbying group of which Florida AERBVI is a member).

MATERIALS DELIVERY, cont.

6) FIMCVH Braille Production Center Proposal, 1985

Describes FIMC's proposed plans to automate braille production during FY 1985-86 and FY 1986-87. Includes background information, equipment requirements and budget. Dissemination included FIMC staff, BEES staff, Vision Steering Committee, Coalition for Exceptional Students (lobbying organization) and selected legislators.

7) "The Visual Field"

Originating in 1982, "The Visual Field" reports Center activities, inservice/training opportunities, current research, new products, etc. "The Visual Field" is desseminated to 600 professionals, 2-3 times/year. Florida distribution includes teachers of the visually impaired, district ESE administrators, FDLRS Centers, DBS personnel, and Vision Steering Committee. Nadional distribution includes state vision consultants, university training program personnel, residential school administrators and instructional resource center staff.

8) FIMCVH Services & Procedures Handbook

The FIMCVH Handbook was developed in 1973; and updated in 1974, 1975, 1976, and 1977. The publication describes specific Center procedures for ordering/repairing and returning student materials. Dissemination included teachers of the visually impaired, district administrators, FDLRS Centers, agencies and others that utilized FIMCVH services.

STUDENT ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION

9) State Board of Education Rule (SBER) 6A-6.3014

Rule defines visual impairment, and describes criteria for eligibility, procedures for screening, procedures for student evaluation instructional program and supportive services.

10) Division of Public Schools Memorandum (DPS) 84-139

DPS 84-139 describes 1983 changes in State Board of Education Rule. The major changes involved Section #4: Procedures for Student Evaluation. Memo was disseminated to district superintendents,ESE directors and vision program contacts.

11) DPS 84-189: Cooperative Agreement: Department of Education and the Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind

Written in 1983, this cooperative agreement highlights the responsibilities of the Florida School for the Deaf and Blind and the Division of Public Schools (BEES) in providing comprehensive services to the visually impaired. Dissemination is described in the cover memo.

STUDENT ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION, cont.

12) Memorandum of Agreement: Florida School for the Deaf and Blind and Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students

This memorandum describes, in depth, the purpose/function of the Florida School for the Deaf and Blind Outreach Services. The memo was disseminated in 1984 to District superintendents, ESE directors, FDLRS centers, Program Contact, FIMCVH and FSDB staff.

13) Statistics: FSDB Child Study Center Outreach Services

Documented statistics relating to FSDB's Child Study Center Outreach Activities, 1982 - 85.

14) Project Proposal: Computer Resource Center for the Deaf and the Blind

The Computer Resource Center was established by the Florida Legislature in 1984 to meet educational needs of deaf & blind population in the area of computer-assisted instruction.

The status on working with blind students will be further defined after an Ad Hoc committee meeting in Orlando, Febrary 8, 1985.

INSERVICE

15) "Seminar on Visually Impaired: Weekend With Experts"

"Weekend With the Experts" is a self-supporting inservice program coordinated by BEES State Consultant and Florida State University. Since 1982, FIMC has assisted with program coordination. Each year, approximately 50-70 Florida professionals participate in the five-year-old program. Honorarium paid to presenters is generated through participant registration fees. Participants include teachers (public, residential, agency), university personnel and out-of-state professionals.

16) "Florida Conference of Educators and Volunteers Serving the Visually Impaired"

Based on the CTEVH concept, the first Florida Conference offered volunteers and educators joint training opportunities. One hundred fifty individuals participated in the conference. Conference evaluation information is included in FIMCVH's 1983-84 Annual Report.

17) FSDB inservice activities

FSDB's 1982-83 and 1984-85 inservice activities are highlighted. Residential teachers participated in the Weekend With The Experts program. In addition, public school personnel have attended workshops sponsored by FSDB.

INSERVICE, cont.

18) "Technical Assistance Reports"

Newsletter published by the Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students (BEES) and disseminated statewide to ESE directors, supervisors, vision contacts, FDLRS Centers, FDLRS Specialized Centers (FIMC), etc. See index for specifics.

19) Memorandum of Understanding Between the Division of Blind Services and the Division of Public Schools

Written in 1980, this memorandum of understanding describes the responsibilities of the Division of Blind Services and the Division of Public Schools (BEES) in providing comprehensive services to the visually impaired. Has been updated; due to be signed by the Division Directors in mid-February.

20) Florida Statutes pertaining to the Division of Blind Services

Describes Florida Statutues pertaining to DBS. Addresses DBS' functions, confidential records and rights of the visually impaired.

Additional Materials Reviewed By Team

1) Resource Manual Vol 1-E (May 1983)
    Florida Statutes and State Board of Education Rules:
        Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind
        Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services
2) Resource Manual Vol 1-B (January 1984)
    Florida Statutes and State Board of Education Rules
    - - - Excerpts for Programs for Exceptional Students
3) Florida State Plan for Fiscal Years (1984-86), under Part B Education of the Handicapped Act as amended by Public Law 94-142
4) Florida Conference of Educators and Volunteers Serving the Visually Impaired: Individual Session Evaluation forms
5) Computer Applications in Exceptional Student Education
6) Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System descriptive pamphlet
7) Clearinghouse Catalog: Film Collection
    Mini-Catalog (January 1984)
8) Special Project Summary 1984-85
9) Florida Diagnostic and learning Resources System Contact List: Associate and Specialized Centers
10) Medical and Social Services Program, Division of Blind Services
11) Division of Blind Services
    Memorandum to Advisory Council concerning the Development of Statewide Parent Organization (April 17, 1984)
12) Memorandum of Understanding Between the Division of Blind Services and the Division of Public Schools , Florida Department of Education (draft)
13) Division of blind Services Cooperative Agreements with selected public schools
14) Interagency cooperative Services Agreement Between the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, Vocational Rehabilitation Program office and the Florida Department of Education, Division of Blind Services, Division of Public Schools, Division of Vocational Education (draft, 1/31/85)

15) Cooperative Agreement Between the Division of Blind Services, Department of Education and Children's Medical Services, Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services (10/25/84)

16) Memorandum of Understanding Between the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, Developmental Services Program Office and Department of Education, Division of Blind Services (1/17/85)

17) Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System description of Specialized Centers, 1983-84

18) Florida Conference of Educators and Volunteers Serving the Visually Impaired (Session Evaluations)

19) Sandalwood Junior-Senior High School: building and program overview

20) Location of instructional staff (map of Florida)

21) Location of instructional staff and administrative support staff (chart)

22) Visually Impaired Program Update, Fall 1984

23) Issues and Implementation of Curriculum Frameworks for Visually Impaired Students

24) Curriculum Framework: ESE Skills for Visually Impaired Learners

25) Curriculum Framework: ESE - orientation and Mobility Skills

26) Sample District Procedures: Program for Visually Impaired (Putnam, Clay, Duval)

27) Letter of Agreement Between Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students and Florida State University Center for Professional Development re: "Florida Seminar on Visually Impaired: Weekend With The Experts"

28) Weekend With The Experts, 1984: Opinionnaire

29) Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind "Oracle," January, 1985

30) Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind "The Florida School Herald," Winter, 1985

31) Excerpts from Course Code Directory, 1985-86, pp. 3-11; 109; 111; 113.

32) February 21, 1985 memorandum from Joe D. Miles, Director and Douglas Crawford, Director to School District Superintendents re: Vocational Education for Exceptional Students

33) DPS - memorandum 84-327 re: Graduation Requirements for Exceptional Students

34) Association for Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired certification survey

35) A Resource Manual for the Development and Evaluation of Special Programs for Exceptional Students

36) Volume I-B: Florida Statutes and State Board of Education Rules: Excerpts for Programs for Exceptional Students, 1984

37) Volume I-E: Florida Statutes and State Board of Education Rules: Florida School for the Deaf and Blind -- Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, 1983

38) Volume III-F:1: Electronic Communication Devices for Visually Impaired Students, 1982

39) Volume III-F:2: Computer Accessibility for the Visually Impaired, 1983

40) Volume IV-H: Diagnostic/Prescriptive Model for Training Interdisciplinary Personnel Working with Profoundly Mentally Handicapped Learners, 1984

41) Volume V-E: Project IVEY: Increasing Visual Efficiency

Assessment Items:

42) Metropolitan District
Preschool student
(includes functional vision report)

43) Metropolitan District
Preschool student served in homebound setting

44) Metropolitan District
Multi-handicapped student (school-age)

45) Metropolitan District
Preschool student
(includes orientation and mobility assessment and functional vision report)

46) National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped, Report of On-Site Review, Department for the Blind, Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind, March 13-17, 1983 (Confidential provided by Tinsley)

Individual Education Plans (IEP's)

47) Rural District
Itinerant Program
Multi-handicapped, elementary student

48) Rural District
Resource Program
Totally blind, middle school student

49) Rural District
Itinerant Program
Totally blind, elementary student

50) Rural District
Itinerant Program
Multi-handicapped student

51) Rural District
Itinerant Program
Partially-sighted, elementary student

52) Rural District
Itinerant Program
Partially-sighted, elementary student

53) Rural district
Itinerant Program/Varying Exceptionalities
Partially-sighted, middle school student

54) Metropolitan district
Itinerant Program
High functioning, secondary school student

55) Metropolitan District
Itinerant Program
Elementary student

56) Metropolitan District
Resource Program
Multi-handicapped student receiving O&M services

57) Metropolitan District
Resource Program
Totally Blind student receiving O&M services/adaptive PE.

Appendix B-1
Interview Schedules

REVIEW OF THE SUPPORT SERVICES PROVIDED TO
VISUALLY IMPAIRED STUDENTS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

AGENDA

ORIENTATION SESSION

Holiday Inn Bay Meadows (Trustee Room)

March 3, 1985; 1:00p.m. - 4:30p.m.

1:00 - 2:00	Team Leader meets with Team Members	
2:00 - 2:15	Welcome	Dr. Kathleen Huebner
2:15 - 4:00	Overview of Present Services/Future Directions of Support Services:	
	BEES Program Services	Doris Nabi
	Division of Blind Serv	Don Wedewer Sheryl Gutherie
	Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind	Dr. Tuck Tinsley
	BEES Program Development	Marie Kovecsi
	Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Handicapped	Paul Lewis Suzanne Dalton
4:00 - 4:30	American Foundation for the Blind (AFB) responsibilities	Dr. Susan Spungin

Schedule for JACKSONVILLE
Monday, March 4, 1985

CONSULTANT	8:30- 9:45	9:45-10:00	10:00-11:15	11:15- 1:00	1:00- 2:00	2:00- 3:00
Dr. Kathleen Huebner, Consultant AMERICAN FOUNDATION F/T BLIND (New York, NY)	Principal, Sandalwood Jr-Sr High Sch Ms. Lynda Lewis	Break	Guid Counselor & Curr Spec Sandalwood Carol Anderson Janice Carter Claire Horton	Lunch	ESE General Director Duval County Dr. Diane Gillespie	ESE Supervisor Duval County Dr. Etoile Graves-Smith
Dr. Anne Corn, Asst. Professor UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS (Austin, TX)	Vision Teacher, Alden Road ESE Center Debbie Rosengarten	Break	Principal, Alden Road ESE Center Mr. Jack Barile	Lunch	ESE Specialist Clay County Susan Helmey	Vision Teacher, Clay County Regina Goshorn
Ms. Julia Holton Todd, Coordinator OHIO RESOURCE CTR FOR LOW INCIDENCE HAND (Columbus, OH)	Parent of Visually Imp Student Rhea Oates	Break	Volunteer Betty Lyons	Lunch	ESE Director Putnam County Ms. Vivian Guarnera	Vision Teacher, Putnam County Peggy Lewis
Dr. LaRhea Sanford, Teacher NASHVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS (Nashville, TN)	Vision Teacher, Sandalwood CoCo Anderson	Break	Visually Imp Student Sandalwood James Oates	Lunch	ESE Program Representative Duval County Ann Henkel	FDLRS Representative Duval County Ginny McNeill

STUDY OF THE SUPPORT SERVICES PROVIDED TO VISUALLY IMPAIRED STUDENTS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Schedule for ST. AUGUSTINE
Tuesday, March 5, 1985

CONSULTANT	8:30- 9:45	9:45-10:00	10:00-11:15	11:15-12:45	12:45- 2:00	3:30- 5:00
Dr. Kathleen Huebner, Consultant AMERICAN FOUNDATION F/T BLIND (New York, NY)	President, Florida Sch f/t Deaf & Blind Mr. Robert Dawson	Break	Principal, Department f/t Blind Dr. Tuck Tinsley	Lunch	ESE Director St. Johns County Ms. Carol Parrish	Section Administrator, BEES Dr. Elinor Elfner
Dr. Anne Corn, Asst. Professor UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS (Austin, TX)	Coordinator, Child Study Center Jerry Prokes	Break	Psychologist & Diagnostician Child Study Ctr Penny Palmer Nancy Stavropulos	Lunch	Visually Imp Students Kim Schreier Ramon Vela	Section Administrator, BEES Dr. Elinor Elfner
Ms. Julia Holton Todd, Coordinator OHIO RESOURCE CTR FOR LOW INCIDENCE HANDICAPPED (Columbus, OH)	Supv Teacher Coord:Curr Guid Counselor J. Vandergrift E.J. Washington M.J. Dillon	Break	Math Teacher, FSDB Kathy Myers	Lunch	Asst Principal Dept f/t Blind John Gunia	Section Administrator, BEES Dr. Elinor Elfner
Dr. LaRhea Sanford, Teacher NASHVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS (Nashville, TN)	Coord: Media Services Bob Graham	Break	Teacher,Multihd Coord:Deaf-Bl Carol Miller Joel Hoff	Lunch	DBS Dist Mgr DBS VR Couns Alex McLaughlin Reginald Oxley	Section Administrator, BEES Dr. Elinor Elfner

STUDY OF THE SUPPORT SERVICES PROVIDED TO VISUALLY IMPAIRED STUDENTS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Schedule for MIAMI
Thursday, May 16, 1985

Interviews to be held at: Eden Roc Hotel
4525 Collins Avenue
Miami Beach, FL 33140
(305) 531-0000

CONSULTANT	8:00-9:00	9:00-9:15	9:15-10:15	10:15-11:15	11:15-1:00	
Dr. Kathleen Huebner, Consultant AMER FDN F/T BLIND (New York)	DADE ESE Supv. Dr. Pete Paraskeva	BREAK	DADE FDLRS Dr. Eleanor Levine & Fareed Haj	BROWARD ESE Program Monitor Mr. William Benchik	LUNCH and travel to Airport	
Dr. Anne Corn Asst Professor UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS (Austin, TX)	DADE FDLRS Dir Dr. Eleanor Levine & Fareed Haj	BREAK	DADE Vision Teacher Mr. Robert Patterson	BROWARD ESE Program Monitor Mr. William Benchik	LUNCH and travel to Airport	
Ms. Julia Holton Todd, Coordinator OHIO RES CTR FOR LOW INCID (Columbus,OH)	DADE Vision Teacher(Inner City) Ms. Fran Boyd	BREAK	DADE Parent. Ms. Linda Machado	DADE Regular Math Teacher Mr. Milton Zoloth	LUNCH and travel to Airport	
Dr. LaRhea Sanford, Teacher NASHVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS (Nashville,TN)	DADE O & M Spec. Ms. Zella Castany	BREAK	DADE Regular Edu. Student & Vision Teach. Anna Vidal & Ms. Carol Hedtke	BROWARD ESE Project Manager Ms. Kit Kengott	LUNCH and travel to Airport	

STUDY OF THE SUPPORT SERVICES PROVIDED TO VISUALLY IMPAIRED STUDENTS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Schedule for TAMPA
Friday, May 17, 1985

Interviews to be held at: Florida Instructional
Materials Center
5002 North Lois Avenue
Tampa, FL 33614
(813) 876-5016 or 1-800-282-9193

CONSULTANT	8:30-9:30	9:30-9:45	9:45-10:45	10:45-11:45	11:45-1:30	1:30-2:30
Dr. Kathleen Huebner, Consultant Amer Fdn f/t Blind, New York	HILLSBOROUGH Asst Supt of Instr Frank Farmer (School Adm. Center)	BREAK	HILLSBOROUGH ESE Admin Monte Betz Eugene Wieczorek	HILLSBOROUGH Teacher Inner-City Lynette Wenner	LUNCH	PINELLAS ESE Supervisor Jonathan McIntire
Dr. Anne Corn, Asst Professor University of Texas Austin, TX	HILLSBOROUGH FIMC Volunteer Meg Wagner	BREAK	HIGHLANDS Vision Teach. Lois Lange	HILLSBOROUGH Parent of Vis.Imp. Student Blanca Lopez	LUNCH	BREVARD FDLRS/TECH Eileen Pracek
Ms. Julia Holton Todd, Coordinator Ohio Resource Ctr for Low Incidence Hand Columbus, OH	HILLSBOROUGH Visu Imp Student Darrin Porter	BREAK	SARASOTA Project CAISH Warren Brown	HILLSBOROUGH FIMC Volunteer(s) Louise Smith Barbara Morgan	LUNCH	HILLSBOROUGH Tour of FIMC Paul Lewis
Dr. LaRhea Sanford, Teacher Nashville Public Schools Nashville, TN	HILLSBOROUGH Coord,Vision Laura Brown	BREAK	PASCO Vision Teach. Margaret Schiffer	HILLSBOROUGH Regular Science Tch. Victoria Law, Chamberlain High School	LUNCH	PINELLAS Resource Specialist Noreen Murphy

STUDY OF THE SUPPORT SERVICES PROVIDED TO VISUALLY IMPAIRED STUDENTS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Schedule for TAMPA
Friday, May 17, 1985

CONSULTANT	2:30-2:45	2:45-3:45	3:45-4:15			
Dr. Kathleen Huebner	BREAK	HILLSBOROUGH FIMC Supv. Paul Lewis	HILLSBOROUGH FIMC Supv. Wrap-up Paul Lewis			
Dr. Anne Corn	BREAK	HILLSBOROUGH Preschool Teacher Maureen Gorman	HILLSBOROUGH FIMC Supv. Wrap-up Paul Lewis			
Ms. Julia Holton Todd	BREAK	HILLSBOROUGH FIMC & Vols. John Cardinale Dan Carter C.Staufenbeil	HILLSBOROUGH FIMC Supv. Wrap-up Paul Lewis			
Dr. LaRhea Sanford	BREAK	HILLSBOROUGH FIMC Coord. Suzanne Dalton	HILLSBOROUGH FIMC Supv. Wrap-up Paul Lewis			

Appendix B-2
Interviewees

ORIENTATION MEETING: Jacksonville (March 3, 1985)

Mrs. Doris Nabi, Administrator
BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS
Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(904) 488-1712

Mr. Donald H. Wedewer, Director
DIVISION OF BLIND SERVICES
Douglas Building
2540 Executive Center Circle West
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(904) 488-1330

Dr. Tuck Tinsley, Principal
FLORIDA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF AND THE BLIND
207 N. San Marco Avenue
St. Augustine, FL 32084
(904) 824-1654

Ms. Marie H. Kovecsi, Consultant
BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS
Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(904) 488-2054

Mr. Paul Lewis, Supervisor
FLORIDA INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CENTER
5002 North Lois Avenue
Tampa, FL 33614
(813) 876-5016

Ms. Sherrie Guthrie, Counselor
DIVISION OF BLIND SERVICES
111 Coast Line Drive E. #603
Box 57-58
Jacksonville, FL 32202
(904) 359-6352

Dr. Elinor Elfner, Administrator (March 5, 1985)
BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS
Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(904) 488-2137

ON-SITE INTERVIEW: Jacksonville (March 4, 1985)

Ms. Lynda Lewis, Principal
Ms. Carol Anderson, Guidance Counselor
Ms. Janis Carter, Curriculum Specialist
Ms. Claire Horton, Curriculum Specialist
Ms. CoCo Anderson, Teacher
Mr. James Oates, Student

SANDALWOOD JR-SR HIGH SCHOOL
2750 John Prom Blvd.
Jacksonville, FL 32216
(904) 641-1020

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Mr. Jack Barile, Principal
Ms. Debbie Rosengarten, Teacher

ALDEN ROAD EXCEPTIONAL
11780 Alden Road
Jacksonville, FL 32216
(904) 641-1900

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Dr. Diane Gillespie, General Director
Dr. Etoile Graves-Smith, Supervisor for Instructional Program Support
Ms. Ann Henkel, Program Representative

EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION
1701 Prudential Drive, 4th Floor
Jacksonville, FL 32207
(904) 390-2071

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Ms. Ginny McNeill, FDLRS Representative
Ms. Beth Ennis, On-site Contact

FDLRS/Crown Associate Center
1450 Flagler Avenue, Room 15
Jacksonville, FL 32207
(904) 390-2154

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Ms. Vivian Guarnera, Supervisor

EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION
Post Office Box 797
Palatka, FL 32077
(904) 328-5763

Ms. Peggy Lewis, Teacher

ELEANOR H. MILLER SCHOOL
1001 Husson Avenue
Palatka, FL 32077
(904) 328-5763

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

ON-SITE INTERVIEW: Jacksonville (March 4, 1985)

Ms. Susan Helmey, ESE Specialist	Ms. Regina Goshorn, Teacher
EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION 900 Walnut Street Green Cove Springs, FL 32043 (904) 284-6500 X634	RIDGEVIEW SCHOOL 421 Jefferson Avenue Orange Park, FL 32073 (904) 272-8171

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Ms. Rhea Oates, Parent

1550 Harbor Oaks Road
Jacksonville, FL 32207

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Ms. Betty Lyons, Media Specialist

FISHWEIR ELEMENTARY
3977 Herschel Street
Jacksonville, FL 32205
(904) 389-2230

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

ON-SITE INTERVIEW: St. Augustine (March 5, 1985)

Mr. Robert T. Dawson, President
Dr. Tuck Tinsley, Principal
Mr. Jerry E. Prokes, Director of Child Study Center
Mr. Robert Graham, Coordinator of Media Services
Mr. John Gunia, Assistant Principal
Mr. Joel Hoff, Supervising Teacher of Elementary and Coordinator of Deaf-Blind
Mr. Jerry Vandergrift, Supervising Teacher for Secondary
Ms. Ella Jean Washington, Coordinator of Curriculum & Staff Development
Ms. Penny Palmer, Psychologist
Ms. Nancy Stavropulos, Diagnostician
Ms. Mary Jane Dillon, Guidance Counselor
Ms. Kathy Myers, Teacher
Ms. Carol Miller, Teacher
Ms. Kim Schreier, Student
Mr. Ramon Vela, Student

FLORIDA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF AND THE BLIND
207 N. San Marco Avenue
St. Augustine, FL 32084
(904) 824-1654

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Ms. Carol Parrish, Director

EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION
47 Orange Street
St. Augustine, FL 32084
(904) 824-8174

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Mr. Alex McLaughlin, District Manager

DIVISION OF BLIND SERVICES
1185 Dunn Avenue
Daytona Beach, FL 32014
(904) 252-4722

Mr. Reginald Oxley, VR Counselor

DIVISION OF BLIND SERVICES
P.O. Box 1209
St. Augustine, FL 32085
(904) 824-4750

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

ON-SITE INTERVIEW: Miami (May 16, 1985)

Dr. Peter Paraskeva, Supervisor
Ms. Zella Castany, Orientation & Mobility

EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION
1410 NE 2nd Avenue, Room 1514
Miami, FL 33132
(305) 350-3166

Dr. Eleanor L. Levine, Project Director
Dr. Fareed Haj, Educational Specialist

FDLRS/SOUTH ASSOCIATE CENTER
9220 SW 52nd Terrace
Miami, FL 33165
(305) 274-3501

Mr. Robert Patterson, Teacher

GOLDEN GLADES ELEMENTARY
16520 NW 28th Avenue
Opa Locka, FL 33054
(305) 624-9641

Ms. Fran Boyd, Teacher

NORTH CENTRAL AREA OFFICE (9572)
1080 LaBaron Drive
Miami Springs, FL 33136
(305) 885-2543

Mr. Milton Zoloth, Teacher

MIAMI BEACH SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL
2231 Prairie Avenue
Miami Beach, FL 33139
(305) 532-4515

Ms. Carol Hedtke, Teacher
Ms. Anna Vidal, Regular Education Student

HIALEAH-MIAMI LAKES SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL
7977 W 12th Avenue
Hialeah, FL 33014
(305) 823-1330

ON-SITE INTERVIEW: Miami (May 16, 1985)

Ms. Linda Machado, Parent

12040 SW 121 Terrace
Miami, FL 33186
(305) 233-4593

Mr. William Benchik, Program Monitor
Ms. Kit Kengott, Project Manager

EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION
1005 East Broward Blvd
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301
(305) 765-6653 (Benchik)
(305) 765-6540 (Kengott)

ON-SITE INTERVIEW: Tampa (May 17, 1985)

Mr. Frank M. Farmer, Asst. Superintendent

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SCHOOLS
901 E. Kennedy Blvd.
P.O. Box 3408
Tampa, FL 33601
(813) 272-4050

Dr. Monte L. Betz, General Director
Dr. Eugene Wieczorek, Asst. Director

EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION
411 E. Henderson Avenue
Tampa, FL 33602
(813) 272-4520

Ms. Laura Brown, Coordinator
Ms. Lynette Wenner, Teacher
Ms. Maureen Gorman, Teacher

GEORGE WASHINGTON ANNEX
2704 Highland Avenue
Tampa, FL 33602
(813) 228-0121

Ms. Blanca Lopez, Parent

950 Summit Ridge Drive
Brandon, FL 33511
(813) 681-3402

Mr. Darrin Porter, Student

14906 Wedgewood Place
Tampa, FL 33612
(813) 961-6975

Ms. Victoria Law, Science Teacher

CHAMBERLAIN HIGH SCHOOL
9401 N. Boulevard
Tampa, FL 33612
(813) 932-6141

ON-SITE INTERVIEW: Tampa (May 17, 1985)

Mr. Paul J. Lewis, Supervisor
Ms. Suzanne A. Dalton, Coordinator
Mr. John Cardinale, Coordinator

FLORIDA INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CENTER
FOR THE VISUALLY HANDICAPPED
5002 North Lois Avenue
Tampa, FL 33614
(813) 876-5016

Ms. Lois Lange, Teacher

HIGHLANDS COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD
426 School Street
Sebring, FL 33870
(813) 382-1121

Mrs. Eileen Pracek, Project Coordinator

FDLRS/TECH
1450 Martin Blvd.
Merritt Island, FL 32952
(305) 631-1911

Mr. Warren Brown, Project Manager

PROJECT CAISH
Gocio Elementary School
3450 Gocio Road
Sarasota, FL 32580
(813) 355-3567

Ms. Margaret Schiffer, Teacher

CALUSA ELEMENTARY
2301 Orchid Lake Road
New Port Richey, FL 33552
(813) 842-3809

Mr. Jonathan McIntire, Supervisor
Ms. Noreen Murphy, Resource Specialist

PINELLAS ESE - Euclid Center
1015 -10th Avenue North
St. Petersburg, FL 33705
(813) 823-6696

ON-SITE INTERVIEW: Tampa (May 17, 1985)

Mr. Dan Carter, President

VISUAL AID VOLUNTEERS OF FLORIDA, INC.
506 11th Avenue Northeast
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
(813) 822-2761

Ms. Louise Smith, Braille Assignment Chair

VISUAL AID VOLUNTEERS OF FLORIDA, INC.
7420 Bay Islands Drive South; Apt. 375
St. Petersburg, FL 33707
(813) 360-0632

Mrs. Meg Wagner, Braillist

8444 35 Avenue North
St. Petsburg, FL 33710
(813) 347-9836

Mrs. Barbara Morgan, Braillist

Route 2 Box 2620
Land O Lakes, FL 33539
(813) 996-6208

Mr. Claurence Staufenbeil, Tapist

595 Lois Lane
Belleair Bluffs, FL 33540
(813) 581-7675

AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND, INC. **15 WEST 16th STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10011**

Appendix B-3

Interview Guidelines

. As you begin the interview inform interviewee that there is little time therefore it is important for you both to stay on track. Remind interviewee that you are only interested in gathering information about programs for visually impaired.

. Do not hesitate to stop the interviewee if he begins to ramble. Remember you have information to gather. Extraneous and irrelevant material will be of no use.

. Before you leave, inform interviewee that you may be getting in touch with him later for clarification or expansion and that he should feel free to contact you should he think of something else he wishes to share. Leave your name and phone number with him.

. The interview should not be biased, therefore ask unbiased questions, eg.

- Biased = How would you improve ____?
- Unbiased = Do you think ____ needs improvement?

. Follow-up both negative and postive responses.

- If need is expressed, then ask how it can be met.
- If need is not expressed, then ask what the strengths are.

. If you want someone to expand on a point, first repeat what they've said and then ask them to expand.

Appendix B-4

Florida Project Interview Guide

Materials Considerations

Delivery of student materials - (texts, equipment, tests, timely manner)
Variety/appropriateness of materials
New Materials
Coordination of effort with other agencies
Efficiency
Quality
Policies
In-service training
Technology
Volunteers
Awareness of consumers' need (students, teachers, parents)
Research/Product Development
Future Directions

Change Process
Communications
Bilingual
Types of texts

Interviewee:____________________ Date:________

Position:____________________ Location:________

NOTES:

Appendix B-5

Florida Project Interview Guide

In-Service Training

Needs assessment (how are they determined)
Coordination of effort with other agencies
Participation (Local, Statewide Meeting (May), Weekends with the Experts, Regional Meetings)
Follow-up/Evaluation
Regular education involvement
Change Process
Availability - (geographic region, scheduled, open attendance)
Topical areas (O & M, Low Vision, Technology, diagnostics, etc.)
Parent involvement
Support service involvement
Bilingual
Volunteer involvement
LEA, SEA, Private Agency role
Future Directions

Interviewee:____________________ Date:__________

Position:____________________ Location:__________

NOTES:

AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND, INC.

Appendix B-6

Florida Project Interview Guide

Assessment Considerations

Assessment of: 1) social; 2) vocational; 3) O & M;
4) functional vision; 5) academic/developmental;
6) methods of communication

Teacher Preparation Curriculum
Medical referral; diagnostic and prescriptive
Follow-up
Technology
LEA, SEA, private agency role
Coordination of effort with other agencies
Pre-service
In-service
Continuing education - assessment/interpretation/application
Future Directions

Change process
Parental involvement
Bilingual
Identification

Interviewee:________________ Date:________

Position:________________ Location:________

NOTES:

AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND, INC.

Appendix C-1

Piloted Survey

SURVEY OF FLORIDA SUPPORT SERVICES

ASSURANCE OF CONFIDENTIALITY

Information you provide will be used for statistical purposes only, and will be presented in such a manner that no individual can be identified.

Please select the ONE response for each item that comes closest to your opinion or situation.

1. Please identify your role.

____Parent of visually impaired child.

____Teacher of visually impaired children.

Please check if certified in visual disabilities____.

____FIMCVH staff

____LEA staff

____FDLRS staff

____BEES staff

____DBS staff

15 WEST 16TH STREET NEW YORK N.Y. 10011 TEL (212) 620 2000
CABLE ADDRESS FOUNDATION NEW YORK AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

FIELD OFFICES
Region I 15 West 16th Street New York New York 10011 (212) 620 2019
Region II 1660 L Street N.W. Washington D.C. 20036 (202) 429-0358
Region III 203 North Wabash Avenue Chicago Illinois 60601 (312) 269 0095
Region IV 100 Peachtree Street Atlanta Georgia 30303 (404) 525 2303
Region V 1111 West Mockingbird Lane Dallas Texas 75247 (214) 630 8035
Region VI 760 Market Street San Francisco California 94102 (415) 392 4845
Legislative Office 1660 L Street N.W. Washington D.C. 20036 (202) 467 5996

____FSU staff

____Volunteers

____Other, please specify________________________.

Questions 2 and 3 are to be completed only by parents and teachers of visually impaired children.

2. In which type of school district is your visually impaired child (are your visually impaired children) served?

____Rural

____Suburban

____Urban

3. In which type of placement does your child (do your children) receive educational services due to their visual impairments?

____Residential school

____Self-contained classroom

____Resource room

____Itinerant teacher

____Teacher consultant

____Other, please specify________________________.

Instructions:

(1) Please answer all the following questions as they relate to visually impaired students.

(2) Please answer each question by circling the most appropriate answer. Circle N/A if the question is not applicable or circle NI if you have no ideas.

MATERIALS

1. Can you get the instructional materials (braille textbooks, cassette recorders, etc.) needed by your students?

Never Rarely Most of the Time Always N/A NI

2. The quality (readable braille, high contrast large print, etc.) of the instructional materials is:

Excellent Good Fair Poor N/A NI

3. Can you get current editions of educational materials?

Never Rarely Sometimes Always N/A NI

4. The efficiency of the delivery of materials is:

On Time Usually On Time Usually Late Always Late N/A NI

5. Can you get information on new developments in technology (paperless braillers, computer access equipment, etc.)?

Never Rarely Sometimes Always N/A NI

6. Can you get the technology equipment your students need?

Never Rarely Sometimes Always N/A NI

7. Can you get materials needed by/for special populations (gifted, multi-handicapped, bilingual, etc.)?

Always Sometimes Rarely Never N/A NI

8. Can you get special subject area curricula materials (career/vocational education, music, etc.)?

Never Rarely Sometimes Always N/A NI

9. Can you get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision (daily living skills, orientation and mobility, etc.)?

Never Rarely Sometimes Always N/A NI

10. Do you have ready access to current literature (journals, books, pamphlets, etc.)?

Always Sometimes Rarely Never N/A NI

INSERVICE TRAINING

Note: Inservice training refers to conferences and workshops conducted for parents, volunteers, paraprofessionals, and professionals.

11. Do you have input regarding inservice topics?

Never Rarely Sometimes Always N/A NI

12. How much relevant inservice training is offered locally?

Too Much Enough Too Little None N/A NI

13. How much relevant inservice training is offered regionally?

None Too Little Enough Too Much N/A NI

14. How much relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis?

None Too Little Enough Too Much N/A NI

15. Does your school district or agency give you released time to attend inservice training activities relevant to vision?

Always Sometimes Rarely Never N/A NI

16. Are you reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice activities?

Always Sometimes Rarely Never N/A NI

17. Are weekend inservice training activities convenient?

Never Rarely Sometimes Always N/A NI

18. Do you receive information regarding relevant inservice training?

Always Sometimes Rarely Never N/A NI

19. Is the coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities adequate?

Never Rarely Sometimes Always N/A NI

20. Are regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training regarding the needs of visually impaired students?

Always Sometimes Rarely Never N/A NI

ASSESSMENT

21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually impaired students.

Always Sometimes Rarely Never N/A NI

22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually impaired students.

Never Rarely Sometimes Always N/A NI

23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions. (i.e. type of setting ~~selecting~~)

Never Rarely Sometimes Always N/A NI

24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).

Never Rarely Sometimes Always N/A NI

25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision evaluations, occupational therapy, etc.).

Always Sometimes Rarely Never N/A NI

26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc.).

Never Rarely Sometimes Always N/A NI

27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision, academic/developmental, mode of communication, etc.).

Always Sometimes Rarely Never N/A NI

28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.).

Never Rarely Sometimes Always N/A NI

29. Professionals, parents, and students have opportunities to evaluate different aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, quality of services, etc.).

Never Rarely Sometimes Always N/A NI

30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the area of visual impairments.

Always Sometimes Rarely Never N/A NI

Thank you. Please return this questionnaire to:

Dr. Kathleen Mary Huebner
National Consultant in Education
American Foundation for the Blind
15 West 16th Street
New York, N.Y. 10011

A postage paid, pre-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Appendix C-2
Survey

AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND SURVEY OF FLORIDA SUPPORT SERVICES

ASSURANCE OF CONFIDENTIALITY
Information you provide will be used for statistical purposes only, and will be presented in such a manner that no individual can be identified.

1. Please check (✓) appropriate box to identify your role:

- ☐ Teacher of visually impaired child
  - ☐ Certified in visual disabilities
- ☐ Staff:
  - ☐ FIMCVH
  - ☐ LEA
  - ☐ FDLRS
  - ☐ BEES
  - ☐ DBS
  - ☐ FSU
- ☐ Other, please specify: ____________________

Questions 2 and **3** are to be completed by **teachers** of visually impaired children.

2. Type of school district where your visually impaired students are served:

- ☐ Rural
- ☐ Suburban
- ☐ Urban

3. Type of placement where your students are receiving educational services due to visual impairments:

- ☐ Residential school
- ☐ Self-contained Classroom
- ☐ Resource room
- ☐ Itinerant teacher
- ☐ Teacher consultant
- ☐ Other, please specify: ____________________

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Please answer **all** the following questions as they relate to **visually impaired students.**
2. Please answer such questions by **checking** (✓) the **most** appropriate box.
3. Check **N/A** if question is **N**ot **A**pplicable or **D/K** if you **D**on't **K**now.

MATERIALS

1. You get instructional materials (braille textbooks, cassette recorders, etc.) needed by your students

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

2. The quality (readable braille, high contrast large print, etc.) of the instructional materials is

☐ EXCELLENT ☐ GOOD ☐ FAIR ☐ POOR ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

3. You get current editions of educational materials

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

4. The efficiency of the delivery of materials is:

☐ ON TIME ☐ USUALLY ON TIME ☐ USUALLY LATE ☐ ALWAYS LATE ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

5. You get information on new developments in technology (Paperless braillers, computer access equipment, etc.)

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

6. You get the technology equipment your students need

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

7. You get materials needed by/for special populations (gifted, multi-handicapped, bilingual, etc.)

☐ ALWAYS ☐ GENERALLY ☐ RARELY ☐ NEVER ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

8. You get special subject area curricula materials (career/vocational education, music, etc.)

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

9. You get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision (daily living skills, orientation and mobility, etc.)

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY. ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

10. You have ready access to current literature (journals, books, pamphlets, etc.)

☐ ALWAYS ☐ GENERALLY ☐ RARELY ☐ NEVER ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

INSERVICE TRAINING

NOTE: Inservice training refers to conferences and workshops conducted for parents, volunteers, paraprofessionals, and professionals.

11. You have input regarding inservice topics

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

12. Relevant inservice training is offered locally

☐ TOO MUCH ☐ ENOUGH ☐ TOO LITTLE ☐ NONE ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

13. Relevant training is offered regionally

☐ NONE ☐ TOO LITTLE ☐ ENOUGH ☐ TOO MUCH ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

14. Relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis

☐ NONE ☐ TOO LITTLE ☐ ENOUGH ☐ TOO MUCH ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

15. Your school district or agency gives you released time to attend training activities relevant to vision.

☐ ALWAYS ☐ GENERALLY ☐ RARELY ☐ NEVER ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

16. You are reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice activities

☐ ALWAYS ☐ GENERALLY ☐ RARELY ☐ NEVER ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

ESE 055 EXP 630-85

17. Weekend inservice training activities are convenient

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

18. You receive information regarding relevant inservice training

☐ ALWAYS ☐ GENERALLY ☐ RARELY ☐ NEVER ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

19. The coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities adequate

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

20. Regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training regarding the needs of visually impaired students

☐ ALWAYS ☐ GENERALLY ☐ RARELY ☐ NEVER ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Please answer **all** the following questions as they relate to **visually impaired students**.
2. Please answer such questions by **checking** (✓) the **most** appropriate box.
3. Check **N/A** if question is **N**ot **A**pplicable or **D/K** if you **D**on't **K**now.

ASSESSMENT

21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually impaired students.

☐ ALWAYS ☐ GENERALLY ☐ RARELY ☐ NEVER ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually impaired students.

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions, (i.e., type of setting).

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision evaluations, occupational therapy, etc.).

☐ ALWAYS ☐ GENERALLY ☐ RARELY ☐ NEVER ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc.).

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision, academic/developmental, mode of communication, etc.).

☐ ALWAYS ☐ GENERALLY ☐ RARELY ☐ NEVER ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.).

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

29. Professionals, parents, and students have opportunites to evaluate different aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, quality of services, etc.).

☐ NEVER ☐ RARELY ☐ GENERALLY ☐ ALWAYS ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the area of visual impairments.

☐ ALWAYS ☐ GENERALLY ☐ RARELY ☐ NEVER ☐ N/A ☐ D/K

THANK YOU. Please return this questionnaire to:

Dr. Kathleen Mary Huebner
National Consultant in Education
AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND
15 West 16 Street
New York, NY 10011

A postage paid, pre-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TALLAHASSEE 32301

RALPH D. TURLINGTON
COMMISSIONER

WENDY M. CULLAR, Ed.D.
BUREAU OF EDUCATION
FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS
DIVISION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

May 1, 1985

Appendix C-3

Cover Letter

Dear Participant:

The Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Handicapped has contracted with the American Foundation for the Blind to review the support services provided to visually impaired students in the state of Florida. Part of this review includes collecting information related to materials production and distribution, inservice and assessment.

The review team is making on-site visits to selected sites as well as conducting individual interviews and collecting information on the enclosed questionnaire. It is estimated that it will take 20 minutes to complete these questions and your assistance is needed. Please complete this request for information and return the forms using the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. All surveys should be returned to the team leader:

Dr. Kathleen Mary Huebner
National Consultant in Education
American Foundation for the Blind
15 West 16th Street
New York, New York 10011

Your participation is critical to providing full information to the review team. We appreciate your professional participation in this task and your on-going commitment to the improvement of services to visually impaired students. If you have any questions, please contact Suzanne Dalton, FIMC/VH, 800/282-9193 or 813/876-5016.

Sincerely,

Wendy Cullar

Wendy M. Cullar, Chief

WMC:mkp

Enclosures

Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

Appendix D
Survey Results

American Foundation for the Blind

Florida Department of Education

* * *

Study of Support Services Provided to

Visually Impaired Students in the State of Florida

* * *

SURVEY RESULTS

Florida DoE - AFB Survey Distribution and Response

	SENT	RETURNED	%
Teachers District	154	97	63.0%
Teachers Residential	60	7	11.7%
FIMC STAFF	10	7	70.0%
LEA STAFF	26	11	42.3%
FDLRS STAFF	27	10	37.0%
BEES STAFF	16	2	12.5%
FSU STAFF	4	0	0.0%
DBS STAFF	16	9	56.3%
OTHER STAFF	0	11 (NA SEE BELOW)	
TOTAL	313	154	49.2%

NOTE: In some cases, respondents classified themselves differently than their original selection classification.

TOTAL COMPILATION: 154

```
07/03/85                  Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      1                                 Survey of Florida Support Services
          for:  TOTAL COMPILATION                       MATERIALS

1. You get instructional materials needed by your students.

T:  154    NEVER: 3   1.948 RARELY: 6   3.896 GENERALLY:36   23.38  ALWAYS: 93  60.39 N/A: 12  7.792 D/K:  4  2.597

2. The quality of the instructional materials is:

T:  154    EXCELLENT: 32  20.78 GOOD: 86  55.84 FAIR: 10  6.494 POOR:  0      0 N/A: 17  11.04 D/K:  9  5.844

3. You get current editions of educational materials.

T:  154    NEVER:  2  1.299 RARELY:  8  5.195 GENERALLY: 87  56.49 ALWAYS: 32  20.78 N/A: 17  11.04 D/K: 8  5.195

4. The efficiency of delivery of materials is:

T:  154    ONTIME: 23  14.94 USUALLY ONTIME: 89  57.79 USUALLY LATE: 19  12.34 ALWAYS LATE:  1  .6494 N/A: 14  9.091 D/K:  8  5.195

5. You get information on new developments in technology.

T:  154    NEVER:  7  4.545 RARELY: 13  8.442 GENERALLY: 82  53.25 ALWAYS: 37  24.03 N/A:  9  5.844 D/K:  6  3.896

6. You get the technology equipment your students need.

T:  154    NEVER:  1  .6494 RARELY: 28  18.18 GENERALLY: 74  48.05 ALWAYS: 23  14.94 N/A: 21  13.64 D/K:  7  4.545

7. You get materials needed by/for special populations.

T:  154    ALWAYS: 15  9.740 GENERALLY: 84  54.55 RARELY: 17  11.04 NEVER:  5  3.247 N/A: 25  16.23 D/K:  8  5.195

8. You get special subject area curricula materials.

T:  154    NEVER:  7  4.545 RARELY: 27  17.53 GENERALLY: 67  43.51 ALWAYS: 11  7.143 N/A: 30  19.48 D/K: 12  7.792

9. You get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision.

T:  154    NEVER: 10  6.494 RARELY: 33  21.43 GENERALLY: 61  39.61 ALWAYS: 24  15.58 N/A: 18  11.69 D/K:  8  5.195

10. You have ready access to current literature.

T:  154    ALWAYS: 34  22.08 GENERALLY: 80  51.95 RARELY: 23  14.94 NEVER:  5  3.247 N/A:  6  3.896 D/K:  6  3.896
```

```
07/03/85               Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:     1                              Survey of Florida Support Services
          for:  TOTAL COMPILATION                   INSERVICE TRAINING

11. You have input regarding inservice topics:

T:  154    NEVER:  8  5.195 RARELY: 26  16.88 GENERALLY: 85  55.19  ALWAYS: 29  18.83 N/A:  3  1.948 D/K:  3  1.948

12. Relevant inservice training is offered locally:

T:  154    TOO MUCH:  0      0 ENOUGH: 49  31.82 TOO LITTLE: 71  46.10 NONE: 24  15.58 N/A:  3  1.948 D/K:  7  4.545

13. Relevant training is offered regionally:

T:  154    NONE:  3  1.948 TOO LITTLE: 60  38.96 ENOUGH: 78  50.65 TOO MUCH:  1  .6494 N/A:  3  1.948 D/K:  9  5.844

14. Relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis:

T:  154    NONE:  2  1.299 TOO LITTLE: 40  25.97 ENOUGH:  96  62.34 TOO MUCH:  1  .6494 N/A:  3  1.948 D/K: 12  7.792

15. Your school district or agency gives you release time to attend training
    activities relevant to vision:

T:  154    ALWAYS:  48  31.17 GENERALLY:  73  47.40 RARELY:  18  11.69 NEVER:  2  1.299 N/A:  6  3.896 D/K:  7  4.545

16. You are reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice
    activities:

T:  154    ALWAYS:  44  28.57 GENERALLY:  61  39.61 RARELY:  24  15.58 NEVER:  11  7.143 N/A:  6  3.896 D/K:  8  5.195

17. Weekend inservice training activities are convenient:

T:  154    NEVER:  19  12.34 RARELY:  54  35.06 GENERALLY:  62  40.26 ALWAYS:  4  2.597 N/A:  7  4.545 D/K:  8  5.195

18. You receive information regarding relevant inservice training:

T:  154    ALWAYS:  43  27.92 GENERALLY:  84  54.55 RARELY:  15  9.740 NEVER:  3  1.948 N/A:  5  3.247 D/K:  4  2.597

19. The coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities is adequate:

T:  154    NEVER:  3  1.948 RARELY:  35  22.73 GENERALLY:  81  52.60 ALWAYS:  12  7.792 N/A:  3  1.948 D/K:  20  12.99

20. Regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training
    regarding the needs of visually impaired students:

T:  154    ALWAYS:  6  3.896 GENERALLY:  31  20.13 RARELY:  68  44.16 NEVER:  22  14.29 N/A:  9  5.844 D/K:  18  11.69
```

```
07/03/85                    Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      1                                      Survey of Florida Support Services
              for:  TOTAL COMPILATION                           ASSESSMENT

21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:  154    ALWAYS:  22  14.29 GENERALLY:  75  48.70 RARELY:  35  22.73  NEVER:   4  2.597 N/A:   4  2.597 D/K:  14  9.091

22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:  154    NEVER:   6  3.896 RARELY:  33  21.43 GENERALLY:  72  46.75 ALWAYS:  23  14.94 N/A:   5  3.247 D/K:  15  9.740

23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions:

T:  154    NEVER:   1  .6494 RARELY:  18  11.69 GENERALLY:  75  48.70 ALWAYS:  42  27.27 N/A:   6  3.896 D/K:  12  7.792

24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of IEPs:

T:  154    NEVER:   2  1.299 RARELY:  11  7.143 GENERALLY:  78  50.65 ALWAYS:  50  32.47 N/A:   5  3.247 D/K:   8  5.195

25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision, OT):

T:  154    ALWAYS:  28  18.18 GENERALLY:  87  56.49 RARELY:  22  14.29 NEVER:   3  1.948 N/A:   5  3.247 D/K:   9  5.844

26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired
    students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc):

T:  154    NEVER:   5  3.247 RARELY:  44  28.57 GENERALLY:  73  47.40 ALWAYS:   9  5.844 N/A:   5  3.247 D/K:  18  11.69

27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those
    areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision):

T:  154    ALWAYS:  25  16.23 GENERALLY:  97  62.99 RARELY:  13  8.442 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   4  2.597 D/K:  15  9.740

28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special
    skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.):

T:  154    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:  22  14.29 GENERALLY:  91  59.09 ALWAYS:  12  7.792 N/A:   6  3.896 D/K:  23  14.94

29. Professionals, parents and students have opportunities to evaluate different
    aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, etc):

T:  154    NEVER:   6  3.896 RARELY:  42  27.27 GENERALLY:  64  41.56 ALWAYS:  22  14.29 N/A:   4  2.597 D/K:  16  10.39

30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the
    area of visual impairments:

T:  154    ALWAYS:  16  10.39 GENERALLY:  51  33.12 RARELY:  43  27.92 NEVER:  29  18.83 N/A:   4  2.597 D/K:  11  7.143
```

BEES STAFF

(Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students)

Total Received: 2

```
07/08/85                    Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      1                                    Survey of Florida Support Services
              for: BEES STAFF                               MATERIALS

1. You get instructional materials needed by your students.

T:    2    NEVER: 0       0 RARELY: 0       0 GENERALLY: 0       0  ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

2. The quality of the instructional materials is:

T:    2    EXCELLENT:  0      0 GOOD:  0      0 FAIR:  0      0 POOR:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

3. You get current editions of educational materials.

T:    2    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  0      0 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K: 1     50

4. The efficiency of delivery of materials is:

T:    2    ONTIME:  0      0 USUALLY ONTIME:  0      0 USUALLY LATE:  0      0 ALWAYS LATE:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50
5. You get information on new developments in technology.

T:    2    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  0      0 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

6. You get the technology equipment your students need.

T:    2    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  0      0 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

7. You get materials needed by/for special populations.

T:    2    ALWAYS:  0      0 GENERALLY:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

8. You get special subject area curricula materials.

T:    2    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  0      0 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

9. You get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision.

T:    2    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  0      0 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

10. You have ready access to current literature.

T:    2    ALWAYS:  0      0 GENERALLY:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50
```

```
07/08/85                     Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      1                                   Survey of Florida Support Services
               for: BEES STAFF                            INSERVICE TRAINING

11. You have input regarding inservice topics:

T:    2    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  0      0  ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

12. Relevant inservice training is offered locally:

T:    2    TOO MUCH:  0      0 ENOUGH:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  0      0 NONE:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

13. Relevant training is offered regionally:

T:    2    NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  0      0 ENOUGH:  0      0 TOO MUCH:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

14. Relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis:

T:    2    NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  0      0 ENOUGH:  0      0 TOO MUCH:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

15. Your school district or agency gives you release time to attend training
    activities relevant to vision:

T:    2    ALWAYS:  0      0 GENERALLY:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

16. You are reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice
    activities:

T:    2    ALWAYS:  0      0 GENERALLY:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

17. Weekend inservice training activities are convenient:

T:    2    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  0      0 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

18. You receive information regarding relevant inservice training:

T:    2    ALWAYS:  0      0 GENERALLY:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

19. The coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities is adequate:

T:    2    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  0      0 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50

20. Regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training
    regarding the needs of visually impaired students:

T:    2    ALWAYS:  0      0 GENERALLY:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  1     50 D/K:  1     50
```

```
07/08/85                    Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      1                                  Survey of Florida Support Services
             for: BEES STAFF                                 ASSESSMENT

21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually
     impaired students:

T:    2    ALWAYS:   0       0 GENERALLY:   0       0 RARELY:   0       0  NEVER:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   2    100

22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually
     impaired students:

T:    2    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   0       0 GENERALLY:   0       0 ALWAYS:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   2    100

23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions:

T:    2    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   0       0 GENERALLY:   0       0 ALWAYS:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   2    100

24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of IEPs:

T:    2    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   0       0 GENERALLY:   0       0 ALWAYS:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   2    100

25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision, OT):

T:    2    ALWAYS:   0       0 GENERALLY:   0       0 RARELY:   0       0 NEVER:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   2    100

26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired
     students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc):

T:    2    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   0       0 GENERALLY:   0       0 ALWAYS:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   2    100

27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those
     areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision):

T:    2    ALWAYS:   0       0 GENERALLY:   0       0 RARELY:   0       0 NEVER:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   2    100

28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special
     skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.):

T:    2    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   0       0 GENERALLY:   0       0 ALWAYS:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   2    100

29. Professionals, parents and students have opportunities to evaluate different
     aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, etc):

T:    2    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   0       0 GENERALLY:   0       0 ALWAYS:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   2    100

30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the
     area of visual impairments:

T:    2    ALWAYS:   0       0 GENERALLY:   0       0 RARELY:   0       0 NEVER:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   2    100
```

DBS STAFF

(Division of Blind Services)

Total Received: 9

```
07/08/85                         Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      2                                      Survey of Florida Support Services
             for: DBS STAFF                                   MATERIALS

1. You get instructional materials needed by your students.

T:    9    NEVER: 1   11.11 RARELY: 2   22.22 GENERALLY: 2   22.22  ALWAYS:  2  22.22 N/A:  1  11.11 D/K:  1  11.11

2. The quality of the instructional materials is:

T:    9    EXCELLENT:  1  11.11 GOOD:  4  44.44 FAIR:  0      0 POOR:  0      0 N/A:  2  22.22 D/K:  2  22.22

3. You get current editions of educational materials.

T:    9    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  1  11.11 ALWAYS:  1  11.11 N/A:  5  55.56 D/K: 2  22.22

4. The efficiency of delivery of materials is:

T:    9    ONTIME:  1  11.11 USUALLY ONTIME:  2  22.22 USUALLY LATE:  2  22.22 ALWAYS LATE:  0      0 N/A:  2  22.22 D/K:  2  22.22

5. You get information on new developments in technology.

T:    9    NEVER:  1  11.11 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  4  44.44 ALWAYS:  2  22.22 N/A:  1  11.11 D/K:  1  11.11

6. You get the technology equipment your students need.

T:    9    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  6  66.67 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  1  11.11 D/K:  2  22.22

7. You get materials needed by/for special populations.

T:    9    ALWAYS:  0      0 GENERALLY:  4  44.44 RARELY:  2  22.22 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  2  22.22 D/K:  1  11.11

8. You get special subject area curricula materials.

T:    9    NEVER:  1  11.11 RARELY:  2  22.22 GENERALLY:  2  22.22 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  3  33.33 D/K:  1  11.11

9. You get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision.

T:    9    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  3  33.33 GENERALLY:  3  33.33 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  2  22.22 D/K:  1  11.11

10. You have ready access to current literature.

T:    9    ALWAYS:  2  22.22 GENERALLY:  5  55.56 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  2  22.22
```

```
07/08/85                      Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      2                                   Survey of Florida Support Services
             for: DBS STAFF                                    INSERVICE TRAINING

11. You have input regarding inservice topics:

T:    9    NEVER:  1  11.11 RARELY:  1  11.11 GENERALLY:  7  77.78  ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

12. Relevant inservice training is offered locally:

T:    9    TOO MUCH:  0      0 ENOUGH:  4  44.44 TOO LITTLE:  3  33.33 NONE:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  2  22.22

13. Relevant training is offered regionally:

T:    9    NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  3  33.33 ENOUGH:  4  44.44 TOO MUCH:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  2  22.22

14. Relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis:

T:    9    NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  3  33.33 ENOUGH:   4  44.44 TOO MUCH:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   2  22.22

15. Your school district or agency gives you release time to attend training
    activities relevant to vision:

T:    9    ALWAYS:   3  33.33 GENERALLY:   5  55.56 RARELY:   0      0 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  11.11

16. You are reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice
    activities:

T:    9    ALWAYS:   6  66.67 GENERALLY:   2  22.22 RARELY:   0      0 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   1  11.11 D/K:   0      0

17. Weekend inservice training activities are convenient:

T:    9    NEVER:   1  11.11 RARELY:   4  44.44 GENERALLY:   4  44.44 ALWAYS:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0

18. You receive information regarding relevant inservice training:

T:    9    ALWAYS:   0      0 GENERALLY:   8  88.89 RARELY:   0      0 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   1  11.11 D/K:   0      0

19. The coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities is adequate:

T:    9    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   3  33.33 GENERALLY:   5  55.56 ALWAYS:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  11.11

20. Regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training
    regarding the needs of visually impaired students:

T:    9    ALWAYS:   0      0 GENERALLY:   1  11.11 RARELY:   2  22.22 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   2  22.22 D/K:   4  44.44
```

```
07/08/85                        Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      2                                     Survey of Florida Support Services
              for: DBS STAFF                                 ASSESSMENT

21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:    9    ALWAYS:   0       0 GENERALLY:   3  33.33 RARELY:   2  22.22  NEVER:   0       0 N/A:   1  11.11 D/K:   3  33.33

22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:    9    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   2  22.22 GENERALLY:   2  22.22 ALWAYS:   1  11.11 N/A:   1  11.11 D/K:   3  33.33

23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions:

T:    9    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   1  11.11 GENERALLY:   3  33.33 ALWAYS:   2  22.22 N/A:   1  11.11 D/K:   2  22.22

24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of IEPs:

T:    9    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   1  11.11 GENERALLY:   3  33.33 ALWAYS:   2  22.22 N/A:   1  11.11 D/K:   2  22.22

25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision, OT):

T:    9    ALWAYS:   0       0 GENERALLY:   6  66.67 RARELY:   0       0 NEVER:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   3  33.33

26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired
    students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc):

T:    9    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   2  22.22 GENERALLY:   2  22.22 ALWAYS:   1  11.11 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   4  44.44

27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those
    areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision):

T:    9    ALWAYS:   0       0 GENERALLY:   3  33.33 RARELY:   2  22.22 NEVER:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   4  44.44

28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special
    skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.):

T:    9    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   0       0 GENERALLY:   5  55.56 ALWAYS:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   4  44.44

29. Professionals, parents and students have opportunities to evaluate different
    aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, etc):

T:    9    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   2  22.22 GENERALLY:   4  44.44 ALWAYS:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   3  33.33

30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the
    area of visual impairments:

T:    9    ALWAYS:   1  11.11 GENERALLY:   2  22.22 RARELY:   2  22.22 NEVER:   0       0 N/A:   0       0 D/K:   4  44.44
```

FIMC STAFF

(Florida Instructional Materials Center)

Total Received: 7

```
07/08/85                       Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      3                               Survey of Florida Support Services
          for: FIMC STAFF                              MATERIALS

1. You get instructional materials needed by your students.

T:    7    NEVER: 0       0 RARELY: 0       0 GENERALLY: 1   14.29  ALWAYS:  1  14.29 N/A:  4  57.14 D/K:  1  14.29

2. The quality of the instructional materials is:

T:    7    EXCELLENT:  0      0 GOOD:  2  28.57 FAIR:  0      0 POOR:  0      0 N/A:  4  57.14 D/K:  1  14.29

3. You get current editions of educational materials.

T:    7    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  2  28.57 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  4  57.14 D/K: 1  14.29

4. The efficiency of delivery of materials is:

T:    7    ONTIME:  0      0 USUALLY ONTIME:  1  14.29 USUALLY LATE:  1  14.29 ALWAYS LATE:  0      0 N/A:  4  57.14 D/K:  1  14.29

5. You get information on new developments in technology.

T:    7    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  1  14.29 GENERALLY:  1  14.29 ALWAYS:  1  14.29 N/A:  3  42.86 D/K:  1  14.29

6. You get the technology equipment your students need.

T:    7    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  2  28.57 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  4  57.14 D/K:  1  14.29

7. You get materials needed by/for special populations.

T:    7    ALWAYS:  0      0 GENERALLY:  1  14.29 RARELY:  1  14.29 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  4  57.14 D/K:  1  14.29

8. You get special subject area curricula materials.

T:    7    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  1  14.29 GENERALLY:  1  14.29 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  4  57.14 D/K:  1  14.29

9. You get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision.

T:    7    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  2  28.57 ALWAYS:  1  14.29 N/A:  3  42.86 D/K:  1  14.29

10. You have ready access to current literature.

T:    7    ALWAYS:  1  14.29 GENERALLY:  1  14.29 RARELY:  1  14.29 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  3  42.86 D/K:  1  14.29
```

```
07/08/85                    Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:       3                                 Survey of Florida Support Services
         for: FIMC STAFF                              INSERVICE TRAINING

11. You have input regarding inservice topics:

T:    7    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  1  14.29 GENERALLY:  2  28.57  ALWAYS:  1  14.29 N/A:  2  28.57 D/K:  1  14.29

12. Relevant inservice training is offered locally:

T:    7    TOO MUCH:  0  .   0 ENOUGH:  4  57.14 TOO LITTLE:  0      0 NONE:  0      0 N/A:  2  28.57 D/K:  1  14.29

13. Relevant training is offered regionally:

T:    7    NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  0      0 ENOUGH:  3  42.86 TOO MUCH:  0      0 N/A:  2  28.57 D/K:  2  28.57

14. Relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis:

T:    7    NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  0      0 ENOUGH:  4  57.14 TOO MUCH:  0      0 N/A:  2  28.57 D/K:  1  14.29

15. Your school district or agency gives you release time to attend training
    activities relevant to vision:

T:    7    ALWAYS:  3  42.86 GENERALLY:  1  14.29 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  2  28.57 D/K:  1  14.29

16. You are reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice
    activities:

T:    7    ALWAYS:  2  28.57 GENERALLY:  2  28.57 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  2  28.57 D/K:  1  14.29

17. Weekend inservice training activities are convenient:

T:    7    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  2  28.57 GENERALLY:  1  14.29 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  3  42.86 D/K:  1  14.29

18. You receive information regarding relevant inservice training:

T:    7    ALWAYS:  1  14.29 GENERALLY:  1  14.29 RARELY:  1  14.29 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  3  42.86 D/K:  1  14.29

19. The coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities is adequate:

T:    7    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  4  57.14 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  2  28.57 D/K:  1  14.29

20. Regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training
    regarding the needs of visually impaired students:

T:    7    ALWAYS:  0      0 GENERALLY:  2  28.57 RARELY:  1  14.29 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  3  42.86 D/K:  1  14.29
```

```
21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:   7   ALWAYS:   1  14.29 GENERALLY:   2  28.57 RARELY:   0      0  NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   3  42.86 D/K:   1  14.29

22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:   7   NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   1  14.29 ALWAYS:   1  14.29 N/A:   4  57.14 D/K:   1  14.29

23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions:

T:   7   NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   2  28.57 ALWAYS:   0      0 N/A:   4  57.14 D/K:   1  14.29

24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of IEPs:

T:   7   NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   1  14.29 ALWAYS:   0      0 N/A:   4  57.14 D/K:   2  28.57

25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision, OT):

T:   7   ALWAYS:   0      0 GENERALLY:   1  14.29 RARELY:   0      0 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   4  57.14 D/K:   2  28.57

26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired
    students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc):

T:   7   NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   2  28.57 ALWAYS:   0      0 N/A:   4  57.14 D/K:   1  14.29

27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those
    areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision):

T:   7   ALWAYS:   0      0 GENERALLY:   2  28.57 RARELY:   0      0 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   4  57.14 D/K:   1  14.29

28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special
    skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.):

T:   7   NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   2  28.57 ALWAYS:   0      0 N/A:   4  57.14 D/K:   1  14.29

29. Professionals, parents and students have opportunities to evaluate different
    aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, etc):

T:   7   NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   1  14.29 ALWAYS:   0      0 N/A:   4  57.14 D/K:   2  28.57

30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the
    area of visual impairments:

T:   7   ALWAYS:   1  14.29 GENERALLY:   1  14.29 RARELY:   0      0 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   3  42.86 D/K:   2  28.57
```

LEA STAFF

(Local Education Agency Administrators)

Total Received: 11

```
07/08/85                    Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      4                               Survey of Florida Support Services
       for: LEA STAFF                                      MATERIALS

1. You get instructional materials needed by your students.

T:   11    NEVER: 0       0 RARELY: 0       0 GENERALLY: 1    9.091  ALWAYS: 10  90.91 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

2. The quality of the instructional materials is:

T:   11    EXCELLENT:  5  45.45 GOOD:  4  36.36 FAIR:  2  18.18 POOR:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

3. You get current editions of educational materials.

T:   11    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  8  72.73 ALWAYS:  3  27.27 N/A:  0      0 D/K: 0      0

4. The efficiency of delivery of materials is:

T:   11    ONTIME:  5  45.45 USUALLY ONTIME:  4  36.36 USUALLY LATE:  1  9.091 ALWAYS LATE:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  9.091

5. You get information on new developments in technology.

T:   11    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  7  63.64 ALWAYS:  4  36.36 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

6. You get the technology equipment your students need.

T:   11    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  1  9.091 GENERALLY:  7  63.64 ALWAYS:  3  27.27 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

7. You get materials needed by/for special populations.

T:   11    ALWAYS:  1  9.091 GENERALLY:  8  72.73 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  1  9.091 D/K:  1  9.091

8. You get special subject area curricula materials.

T:   11    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  2  18.18 GENERALLY:  8  72.73 ALWAYS:  1  9.091 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

9. You get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision.

T:   11    NEVER:  1  9.091 RARELY:  1  9.091 GENERALLY:  6  54.55 ALWAYS:  3  27.27 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

10. You have ready access to current literature.

T:   11    ALWAYS:  4  36.36 GENERALLY:  7  63.64 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0
```

```
07/08/85                                   Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:        4                                              Survey of Florida Support Services
                for: LEA STAFF                                           INSERVICE TRAINING

11. You have input regarding inservice topics:

T:   11    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  1  9.091 GENERALLY:  4  36.36  ALWAYS:  6  54.55 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

12. Relevant inservice training is offered locally:

T:   11    TOO MUCH:  0      0 ENOUGH:  4  36.36 TOO LITTLE:  3  27.27 NONE:  4  36.36 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

13. Relevant training is offered regionally:

T:   11    NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  7  63.64 ENOUGH:  4  36.36 TOO MUCH:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

14. Relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis:

T:   11    NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  4  36.36 ENOUGH:   7  63.64 TOO MUCH:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0

15. Your school district or agency gives you release time to attend training
    activities relevant to vision:

T:   11    ALWAYS:   5  45.45 GENERALLY:   5  45.45 RARELY:   1  9.091 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0

16. You are reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice
    activities:

T:   11    ALWAYS:   7  63.64 GENERALLY:   3  27.27 RARELY:   1  9.091 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0

17. Weekend inservice training activities are convenient:

T:   11    NEVER:   2  18.18 RARELY:   2  18.18 GENERALLY:   6  54.55 ALWAYS:   1  9.091 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0

18. You receive information regarding relevant inservice training:

T:   11    ALWAYS:   5  45.45 GENERALLY:   5  45.45 RARELY:   1  9.091 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0

19. The coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities is adequate:

T:   11    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   4  36.36 GENERALLY:   4  36.36 ALWAYS:   3  27.27 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0

20. Regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training
    regarding the needs of visually impaired students:

T:   11    ALWAYS:   1  9.091 GENERALLY:   3  27.27 RARELY:   6  54.55 NEVER:   1  9.091 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0
```

```
07/08/85                          Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      4                                    Survey of Florida Support Services
            for: LEA STAFF                                      ASSESSMENT

21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:  11    ALWAYS:   4  36.36 GENERALLY:   5  45.45 RARELY:   2  18.18  NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0
22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:  11    NEVER:   1  9.091 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   6  54.55 ALWAYS:   4  36.36 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0
23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions:

T:  11    NEVER:   1  9.091 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   4  36.36 ALWAYS:   6  54.55 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0
24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of IEPs:

T:  11    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   1  9.091 GENERALLY:   1  9.091 ALWAYS:   9  81.82 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0
25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision, OT):

T:  11    ALWAYS:   6  54.55 GENERALLY:   4  36.36 RARELY:   1  9.091 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0
26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired
    students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc):

T:  11    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   2  18.18 GENERALLY:   6  54.55 ALWAYS:   2  18.18 N/A:   1  9.091 D/K:   0      0
27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those
    areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision):

T:  11    ALWAYS:   5  45.45 GENERALLY:   6  54.55 RARELY:   0      0 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0
28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special
    skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.):

T:  11    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   7  63.64 ALWAYS:   4  36.36 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0
29. Professionals, parents and students have opportunities to evaluate different
    aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, etc):

T:  11    NEVER:   1  9.091 RARELY:   2  18.18 GENERALLY:   3  27.27 ALWAYS:   5  45.45 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0
30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the
    area of visual impairments:

T:  11    ALWAYS:   2  18.18 GENERALLY:   5  45.45 RARELY:   3  27.27 NEVER:   1  9.091 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0
```

OTHER STAFF

Total Received: 11

```
07/08/85                          Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      5                                      Survey of Florida Support Services
            for: OTHER STAFF                                      MATERIALS

1. You get instructional materials needed by your students.

T:   11    NEVER: 0       0 RARELY: 0       0 GENERALLY: 4   36.36  ALWAYS:  4  36.36 N/A:  2  18.18 D/K:  1  9.091

2. The quality of the instructional materials is:

T:   11    EXCELLENT:  2  18.18 GOOD:  5  45.45 FAIR:  0      0 POOR:  0      0 N/A:  3  27.27 D/K:  1  9.091

3. You get current editions of educational materials.

T:   11    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  5  45.45 ALWAYS:  2  18.18 N/A:  3  27.27 D/K: 1  9.091

4. The efficiency of delivery of materials is:

T:   11    ONTIME:  0      0 USUALLY ONTIME:  6  54.55 USUALLY LATE:  1  9.091 ALWAYS LATE:  0      0 N/A:  2  18.18 D/K:  2  18.18

5. You get information on new developments in technology.

T:   11    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  1  9.091 GENERALLY:  4  36.36 ALWAYS:  3  27.27 N/A:  2  18.18 D/K:  1  9.091

6. You get the technology equipment your students need.

T:   11    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  7  63.64 ALWAYS:  1  9.091 N/A:  2  18.18 D/K:  1  9.091

7. You get materials needed by/for special populations.

T:   11    ALWAYS:  2  18.18 GENERALLY:  5  45.45 RARELY:  1  9.091 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  2  18.18 D/K:  1  9.091

8. You get special subject area curricula materials.

T:   11    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  0      0 GENERALLY:  4  36.36 ALWAYS:  1  9.091 N/A:  4  36.36 D/K:  2  18.18

9. You get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision.

T:   11    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  1  9.091 GENERALLY:  4  36.36 ALWAYS:  3  27.27 N/A:  2  18.18 D/K:  1  9.091

10. You have ready access to current literature.

T:   11    ALWAYS:  3  27.27 GENERALLY:  6  54.55 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  1  9.091 D/K:  1  9.091
```

```
07/08/85                          Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      5                                        Survey of Florida Support Services
             for: OTHER STAFF                                     INSERVICE TRAINING

11. You have input regarding inservice topics:

T:   11    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  2  18.18 GENERALLY:  7  63.64  ALWAYS:  1  9.091 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  9.091

12. Relevant inservice training is offered locally:

T:   11    TOO MUCH:  0      0 ENOUGH:  5  45.45 TOO LITTLE:  5  45.45 NONE:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  9.091

13. Relevant training is offered regionally:

T:   11    NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  3  27.27 ENOUGH:  6  54.55 TOO MUCH:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  2  18.18

14. Relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis:

T:   11    NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  3  27.27 ENOUGH:   6  54.55 TOO MUCH:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   2  18.18

15. Your school district or agency gives you release time to attend training
    activities relevant to vision:

T:   11    ALWAYS:   4  36.36 GENERALLY:   4  36.36 RARELY:   0      0 NEVER:   1  9.091 N/A:   1  9.091 D/K:   1  9.091

16. You are reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice
    activities:

T:   11    ALWAYS:   3  27.27 GENERALLY:   5  45.45 RARELY:   1  9.091 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   2  18.18

17. Weekend inservice training activities are convenient:

T:   11    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   7  63.64 GENERALLY:   1  9.091 ALWAYS:   0      0 N/A:   2  18.18 D/K:   1  9.091

18. You receive information regarding relevant inservice training:

T:   11    ALWAYS:   1  9.091 GENERALLY:   7  63.64 RARELY:   2  18.18 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  9.091

19. The coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities is adequate:

T:   11    NEVER:   1  9.091 RARELY:   3  27.27 GENERALLY:   5  45.45 ALWAYS:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   2  18.18

20. Regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training
    regarding the needs of visually impaired students:

T:   11    ALWAYS:   0      0 GENERALLY:   2  18.18 RARELY:   2  18.18 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   2  18.18 D/K:   5  45.45
```

```
07/08/85                         Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      5                                       Survey of Florida Support Services
          for: OTHER STAFF                                       ASSESSMENT

21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:   11    ALWAYS:   5  45.45 GENERALLY:   4  36.36 RARELY:   1  9.091  NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  9.091

22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:   11    NEVER:   1  9.091 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   7  63.64 ALWAYS:   2  18.18 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  9.091

23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions:

T:   11    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   5  45.45 ALWAYS:   5  45.45 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  9.091

24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of IEPs:

T:   11    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   1  9.091 GENERALLY:   2  18.18 ALWAYS:   7  63.64 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  9.091

25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision, OT):

T:   11    ALWAYS:   3  27.27 GENERALLY:   5  45.45 RARELY:   2  18.18 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  9.091

26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired
    students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc):

T:   11    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   2  18.18 GENERALLY:   6  54.55 ALWAYS:   2  18.18 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  9.091

27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those
    areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision):

T:   11    ALWAYS:   4  36.36 GENERALLY:   5  45.45 RARELY:   1  9.091 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  9.091

28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special
    skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.);

T:   11    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   2  18.18 GENERALLY:   7  63.64 ALWAYS:   1  9.091 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  9.091

29. Professionals, parents and students have opportunities to evaluate different
    aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, etc):

T:   11    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   3  27.27 GENERALLY:   5  45.45 ALWAYS:   2  18.18 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  9.091

30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the
    area of visual impairments:

T:   11    ALWAYS:   3  27.27 GENERALLY:   6  54.55 RARELY:   0      0 NEVER:   1  9.091 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  9.091
```

FDLRS STAFF

(Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resource System)

Total Received: 10

```
07/08/85                          Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      6                                   Survey of Florida Support Services
          for: RFDLRS STAFF                                 MATERIALS

1. You get instructional materials needed by your students.
T:  10   NEVER: 0      0 RARELY: 1    10 GENERALLY: 3    30  ALWAYS:  4    40 N/A:  2    20 D/K:  0     0
2. The quality of the instructional materials is:
T:  10   EXCELLENT:  1    10 GOOD:  6    60 FAIR:  0    0 POOR:  0    0 N/A:  1    10 D/K:  2    20
3. You get current editions of educational materials.
T:  10   NEVER:  0     0 RARELY:  0     0 GENERALLY:  3    30 ALWAYS:  4    40 N/A:  2    20 D/K: 1    10
4. The efficiency of delivery of materials is:
T:  10   ONTIME:  4    40 USUALLY ONTIME:  4    40 USUALLY LATE:  0    0 ALWAYS LATE:  0    0 N/A:  2    20 D/K:  0     0
5. You get information on new developments in technology.
T:  10   NEVER:  0     0 RARELY:  0     0 GENERALLY:  7    70 ALWAYS:  2    20 N/A:  1    10 D/K:  0     0
6. You get the technology equipment your students need.
T:  10   NEVER:  0     0 RARELY:  1    10 GENERALLY:  4    40 ALWAYS:  2    20 N/A:  2    20 D/K:  1    10
7. You get materials needed by/for special populations.
T:  10   ALWAYS:  2    20 GENERALLY:  5    50 RARELY:  1    10 NEVER:  0     0 N/A:  2    20 D/K:  0     0
8. You get special subject area curricula materials.
T:  10   NEVER:  0     0 RARELY:  2    20 GENERALLY:  5    50 ALWAYS:  1    10 N/A:  2    20 D/K:  0     0
9. You get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision.
T:  10   NEVER:  0     0 RARELY:  2    20 GENERALLY:  3    30 ALWAYS:  3    30 N/A:  2    20 D/K:  0     0
10. You have ready access to current literature.
T:  10   ALWAYS:  2    20 GENERALLY:  6    60 RARELY:  1    10 NEVER:  0     0 N/A:  1    10 D/K:  0     0
```

```
07/08/85                    Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      6                                Survey of Florida Support Services
          for: RFDLRS STAFF                              ASSESSMENT

21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:  10    ALWAYS:   2     20 GENERALLY:   7     70 RARELY:   1     10  NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0     0

22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:  10    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   1     10 GENERALLY:   7     70 ALWAYS:   1     10 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1    10

23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions:

T:  10    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   4     40 ALWAYS:   5     50 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1    10

24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of IEPs:

T:  10    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   5     50 ALWAYS:   4     40 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1    10

25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision, OT):

T:  10    ALWAYS:   2     20 GENERALLY:   8     80 RARELY:   0      0 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0     0

26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired
    students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc):

T:  10    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   1     10 GENERALLY:   8     80 ALWAYS:   1     10 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0     0

27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those
    areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision):

T:  10    ALWAYS:   3     30 GENERALLY:   6     60 RARELY:   1     10 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0     0

28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special
    skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.):

T:  10    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   5     50 ALWAYS:   2     20 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   3    30

29. Professionals, parents and students have opportunities to evaluate different
    aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, etc):

T:  10    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   0      0 GENERALLY:   6     60 ALWAYS:   2     20 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   2    20

30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the
    area of visual impairments:

T:  10    ALWAYS:   1     10 GENERALLY:   7     70 RARELY:   1     10 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1    10
```

```
07/08/85                        Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      6                                        Survey of Florida Support Services
          for: RFDLRS STAFF                                 INSERVICE TRAINING

11. You have input regarding inservice topics:

T:   10     NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  1     10 GENERALLY:  4     40  ALWAYS:  5     50 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

12. Relevant inservice training is offered locally:

T:   10     TOO MUCH:  0      0 ENOUGH:  5     50 TOO LITTLE:  3     30 NONE:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  2     20

13. Relevant training is offered regionally:

T:   10     NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  1     10 ENOUGH:  8     80 TOO MUCH:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1     10

14. Relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis:

T:   10     NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  0      0 ENOUGH:  8     80 TOO MUCH:  1     10 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1     10

15. Your school district or agency gives you release time to attend training
    activities relevant to vision:

T:   10     ALWAYS:  2     20 GENERALLY:  6     60 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  1     10 D/K:  1     10

16. You are reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice
    activities:

T:   10     ALWAYS:  5     50 GENERALLY:  3     30 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  1     10 D/K:  1     10

17. Weekend inservice training activities are convenient:

T:   10     NEVER:  2     20 RARELY:  1     10 GENERALLY:  5     50 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  2     20

18. You receive information regarding relevant inservice training:

T:   10     ALWAYS:  7     70 GENERALLY:  3     30 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

19. The coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities is adequate:

T:   10     NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  1     10 GENERALLY:  6     60 ALWAYS:  2     20 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1     10

20. Regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training
    regarding the needs of visually impaired students:

T:   10     ALWAYS:  2     20 GENERALLY:  3     30 RARELY:  4     40 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1     10
```

TEACHERS

(Residential and District)

Total Received: 104

```
07/08/85
Page:       7                    Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
               for: TEACHER                        Survey of Florida Support Services
                                                              MATERIALS

1. You get instructional materials needed by your students.

T:  104    NEVER: 2   1.923 RARELY: 3   2.885 GENERALLY:25   24.04  ALWAYS: 72  69.23 N/A:  2  1.923 D/K:  0      0

2. The quality of the instructional materials is:

T:  104    EXCELLENT: 23  22.12 GOOD: 65   62.5 FAIR:  8  7.692 POOR:  0      0 N/A:  6  5.769 D/K:  2  1.923

3. You get current editions of educational materials.

T:  104    NEVER:  2  1.923 RARELY:  8  7.692 GENERALLY: 68  65.38 ALWAYS: 22  21.15 N/A:  2  1.923 D/K: 2  1.923

4. The efficiency of delivery of materials is:

T:  104    ONTIME: 13   12.5 USUALLY ONTIME: 72  69.23 USUALLY LATE: 14  13.46 ALWAYS LATE:  1  .9615 N/A:  3  2.885 D/K:  1  .9615

5. You get information on new developments in technology.

T:  104    NEVER:  6  5.769 RARELY: 11  10.58 GENERALLY: 59  56.73 ALWAYS: 25  24.04 N/A:  1  .9615 D/K:  2  1.923

6. You get the technology equipment your students need.

T:  104    NEVER:  1  .9615 RARELY: 26     25 GENERALLY: 48  46.15 ALWAYS: 17  16.35 N/A: 11  10.58 D/K:  1  .9615

7. You get materials needed by/for special populations.

T:  104    ALWAYS: 10  9.615 GENERALLY: 61  58.65 RARELY: 12  11.54 NEVER:  5  4.808 N/A: 13   12.5 D/K:  3  2.885

8. You get special subject area curricula materials.

T:  104    NEVER:  6  5.769 RARELY: 20  19.23 GENERALLY: 47  45.19 ALWAYS:  8  7.692 N/A: 16  15.38 D/K:  7  6.731

9. You get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision.

T:  104    NEVER:  9  8.654 RARELY: 26     25 GENERALLY: 43  41.35 ALWAYS: 14  13.46 N/A:  8  7.692 D/K:  4  3.846

10. You have ready access to current literature.

T:  104    ALWAYS: 22  21.15 GENERALLY: 55  52.88 RARELY: 21  20.19 NEVER:  5  4.808 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  .9615
```

```
11. You have input regarding inservice topics:

T:  104    NEVER:  7  6.731 RARELY: 20  19.23 GENERALLY: 61  58.65  ALWAYS: 16  15.38 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

12. Relevant inservice training is offered locally:

T:  104    TOO MUCH:  0      0 ENOUGH: 27  25.96 TOO LITTLE: 57  54.81 NONE: 20  19.23 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

13. Relevant training is offered regionally:

T:  104    NONE:  3  2.885 TOO LITTLE: 46  44.23 ENOUGH: 53  50.96 TOO MUCH:  1  .9615 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  .9615

14. Relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis:

T:  104    NONE:  2  1.923 TOO LITTLE: 30  28.85 ENOUGH:  67  64.42 TOO MUCH:   0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:   5  4.808

15. Your school district or agency gives you release time to attend training
    activities relevant to vision:

T:  104    ALWAYS:  31  29.81 GENERALLY:  52     50 RARELY:  17  16.35 NEVER:   1  .9615 N/A:   1  .9615 D/K:   2  1.923

16. You are reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice
    activities:

T:  104    ALWAYS:  21  20.19 GENERALLY:  46  44.23 RARELY:  22  21.15 NEVER:  11  10.58 N/A:   1  .9615 D/K:   3  2.885

17. Weekend inservice training activities are convenient:

T:  104    NEVER:  14  13.46 RARELY:  38  36.54 GENERALLY:  45  43.27 ALWAYS:   3  2.885 N/A:   1  .9615 D/K:   3  2.885

18. You receive information regarding relevant inservice training:

T:  104    ALWAYS:  29  27.88 GENERALLY:  60  57.69 RARELY:  11  10.58 NEVER:   3  2.885 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  .9615

19. The coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities is adequate:

T:  104    NEVER:   2  1.923 RARELY:  24  23.08 GENERALLY:  57  54.81 ALWAYS:   7  6.731 N/A:   0      0 D/K:  14  13.46

20. Regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training
    regarding the needs of visually impaired students:

T:  104    ALWAYS:   3  2.885 GENERALLY:  20  19.23 RARELY:  53  50.96 NEVER:  21  20.19 N/A:   1  .9615 D/K:   6  5.769
```

```
21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:  104    ALWAYS:  10  9.615 GENERALLY:  54  51.92 RARELY:  29  27.88  NEVER:   4  3.846 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   7  6.731

22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:  104    NEVER:   4  3.846 RARELY:  30  28.85 GENERALLY:  49  47.12 ALWAYS:  14  13.46 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   7  6.731

23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions:

T:  104    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:  17  16.35 GENERALLY:  57  54.81 ALWAYS:  24  23.08 N/A:   1  .9615 D/K:   5  4.808

24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of IEPs:

T:  104    NEVER:   2  1.923 RARELY:   8  7.692 GENERALLY:  66  63.46 ALWAYS:  28  26.92 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0

25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision, OT):

T:  104    ALWAYS:  17  16.35 GENERALLY:  63  60.58 RARELY:  19  18.27 NEVER:   3  2.885 N/A:   1  .9615 D/K:   1  .9615

26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired
    students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc):

T:  104    NEVER:   5  4.808 RARELY:  37  35.58 GENERALLY:  49  47.12 ALWAYS:   3  2.885 N/A:   0      0 D/K:  10  9.615

27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those
    areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision):

T:  104    ALWAYS:  13  12.5 GENERALLY:  75  72.12 RARELY:   9  8.654 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   7  6.731

28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special
    skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.):

T:  104    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:  20  19.23 GENERALLY:  65   62.5 ALWAYS:   5  4.808 N/A:   2  1.923 D/K:  12  11.54

29. Professionals, parents and students have opportunities to evaluate different
    aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, etc):

T:  104    NEVER:   5  4.808 RARELY:  35  33.65 GENERALLY:  45  43.27 ALWAYS:  13   12.5 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   6  5.769

30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the
    area of visual impairments:

T:  104    ALWAYS:   8  7.692 GENERALLY:  30  28.85 RARELY:  37  35.58 NEVER:  27  25.96 N/A:   1  .9615 D/K:   1  .9615
```

** Alternate Sort **

TEACHERS: CERTIFIED

Total Received: 78

```
07/08/85                      Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      1                                  Survey of Florida Support Services
       for: TEACHER (CERTIFIED)                            MATERIALS

1. You get instructional materials needed by your students.

T:   78    NEVER: 2   2.564 RARELY: 1   1.282 GENERALLY:20   25.64  ALWAYS: 53  67.95 N/A:  2  2.564 D/K:  0      0

2. The quality of the instructional materials is:

T:   78    EXCELLENT: 19  24.36 GOOD: 48  61.54 FAIR:  4  5.128 POOR:  0      0 N/A:  6  7.692 D/K:  1  1.282

3. You get current editions of educational materials.

T:   78    NEVER:  1  1.282 RARELY:  5  6.410 GENERALLY: 49  62.82 ALWAYS: 19  24.36 N/A:  2  2.564 D/K: 2  2.564

4. The efficiency of delivery of materials is:

T:   78    ONTIME: 10  12.82 USUALLY ONTIME: 55  70.51 USUALLY LATE:  9  11.54 ALWAYS LATE:  0      0 N/A:  3  3.846 D/K:  1  1.282

5. You get information on new developments in technology.

T:   78    NEVER:  3  3.846 RARELY:  6  7.692 GENERALLY: 44  56.41 ALWAYS: 23  29.49 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  2  2.564

6. You get the technology equipment your students need.

T:   78    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY: 19  24.36 GENERALLY: 38  48.72 ALWAYS: 12  15.38 N/A:  9  11.54 D/K:  0      0

7. You get materials needed by/for special populations.

T:   78    ALWAYS:  9  11.54 GENERALLY: 47  60.26 RARELY:  7  8.974 NEVER:  4  5.128 N/A:  8  10.26 D/K:  3  3.846

8. You get special subject area curricula materials.

T:   78    NEVER:  5  6.410 RARELY: 14  17.95 GENERALLY: 34  43.59 ALWAYS:  7  8.974 N/A: 13  16.67 D/K:  5  6.410

9. You get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision.

T:   78    NEVER:  6  7.692 RARELY: 18  23.08 GENERALLY: 37  47.44 ALWAYS: 10  12.82 N/A:  4  5.128 D/K:  3  3.846

10. You have ready access to current literature.

T:   78    ALWAYS: 21  26.92 GENERALLY: 38  48.72 RARELY: 15  19.23 NEVER:  3  3.846 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  1.282
```

```
07/08/85
Page:       1                    Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
              for: TEACHER  (CERTIFIED)           Survey of Florida Support Services
                                                         INSERVICE TRAINING

11. You have input regarding inservice topics:

T:   78    NEVER:  4  5.128 RARELY: 12  15.38 GENERALLY: 47  60.26  ALWAYS: 15  19.23 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

12. Relevant inservice training is offered locally:

T:   78    TOO MUCH:  0      0 ENOUGH: 17  21.79 TOO LITTLE: 43  55.13 NONE: 18  23.08 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

13. Relevant training is offered regionally:

T:   78    NONE:  3  3.846 TOO LITTLE: 38  48.72 ENOUGH: 37  47.44 TOO MUCH:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

14. Relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis:

T:   78    NONE:  2  2.564 TOO LITTLE: 24  30.77 ENOUGH:  49  62.82 TOO MUCH:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   3  3.846

15. Your school district or agency gives you release time to attend training
    activities relevant to vision:

T:   78    ALWAYS:  22  28.21 GENERALLY:  42  53.85 RARELY:  12  15.38 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   1  1.282 D/K:   1  1.282

16. You are reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice
    activities:

T:   78    ALWAYS:  15  19.23 GENERALLY:  33  42.31 RARELY:  20  25.64 NEVER:   7  8.974 N/A:   1  1.282 D/K:   2  2.564

17. Weekend inservice training activities are convenient:

T:   78    NEVER:   9  11.54 RARELY:  31  39.74 GENERALLY:  33  42.31 ALWAYS:   1  1.282 N/A:   1  1.282 D/K:   3  3.846

18. You receive information regarding relevant inservice training:

T:   78    ALWAYS:  20  25.64 GENERALLY:  49  62.82 RARELY:   6  7.692 NEVER:   3  3.846 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0

19. The coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities is adequate:

T:   78    NEVER:   2  2.564 RARELY:  17  21.79 GENERALLY:  44  56.41 ALWAYS:   4  5.128 N/A:   0      0 D/K:  11  14.10

20. Regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training
    regarding the needs of visually impaired students:

T:   78    ALWAYS:   3  3.846 GENERALLY:  13  16.67 RARELY:  41  52.56 NEVER:  17  21.79 N/A:   1  1.282 D/K:   3  3.846
```

```
07/08/85
Page:       1                  Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
             for: TEACHER   (CERTIFIED)          Survey of Florida Support Services
                                                            ASSESSMENT

21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:   78    ALWAYS:   7  8.974 GENERALLY:  39     50 RARELY:  24  30.77  NEVER:   4  5.128 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   4  5.128
22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:   78    NEVER:   4  5.128 RARELY:  24  30.77 GENERALLY:  35  44.87 ALWAYS:  12  15.38 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   3  3.846
23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions:

T:   78    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:  14  17.95 GENERALLY:  43  55.13 ALWAYS:  17  21.79 N/A:   1  1.282 D/K:   3  3.846
24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of IEPs:

T:   78    NEVER:   2  2.564 RARELY:   6  7.692 GENERALLY:  48  61.54 ALWAYS:  22  28.21 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0
25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision, OT):

T:   78    ALWAYS:  14  17.95 GENERALLY:  44  56.41 RARELY:  17  21.79 NEVER:   2  2.564 N/A:   1  1.282 D/K:   0      0
26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired
    students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc):

T:   78    NEVER:   4  5.128 RARELY:  27  34.62 GENERALLY:  39     50 ALWAYS:   2  2.564 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   6  7.692
27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those
    areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision):

T:   78    ALWAYS:   8  10.26 GENERALLY:  60  76.92 RARELY:   6  7.692 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   4  5.128
28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special
    skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.):

T:   78    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:  13  16.67 GENERALLY:  53  67.95 ALWAYS:   3  3.846 N/A:   2  2.564 D/K:   7  8.974
29. Professionals, parents and students have opportunities to evaluate different
    aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, etc):

T:   78    NEVER:   3  3.846 RARELY:  28  35.90 GENERALLY:  34  43.59 ALWAYS:   9  11.54 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   4  5.128
30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the
    area of visual impairments:

T:   78    ALWAYS:   5  6.410 GENERALLY:  22  28.21 RARELY:  28  35.90 NEVER:  22  28.21 N/A:   1  1.282 D/K:   0      0
```

** Alternate Sort **

TEACHERS: NOT CERTIFIED

Total Received: 26

```
07/03/85
Page:      1                    Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
             for: TEACHER  (NOT CERTIFIED)        Survey of Florida Support Services
                                                            MATERIALS

1. You get instructional materials needed by your students.
T:   26    NEVER: 0       0 RARELY: 2   7.692 GENERALLY: 5   19.23  ALWAYS: 19  73.08 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0
2. The quality of the instructional materials is:
T:   26    EXCELLENT:  4  15.38 GOOD: 17  65.38 FAIR:  4  15.38 POOR:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  3.846
3. You get current editions of educational materials.
T:   26    NEVER:  1  3.846 RARELY:  3  11.54 GENERALLY: 19  73.08 ALWAYS:  3  11.54 N/A:  0      0 D/K: 0      0
4. The efficiency of delivery of materials is:
T:   26    ONTIME:  3  11.54 USUALLY ONTIME: 17  65.38 USUALLY LATE:  5  19.23 ALWAYS LATE:  1  3.846 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0
5. You get information on new developments in technology.
T:   26    NEVER:  3  11.54 RARELY:  5  19.23 GENERALLY: 15  57.69 ALWAYS:  2  7.692 N/A:  1  3.846 D/K:  0      0
6. You get the technology equipment your students need.
T:   26    NEVER:  1  3.846 RARELY:  7  26.92 GENERALLY: 10  38.46 ALWAYS:  5  19.23 N/A:  2  7.692 D/K:  1  3.846
7. You get materials needed by/for special populations.
T:   26    ALWAYS:  1  3.846 GENERALLY: 14  53.85 RARELY:  5  19.23 NEVER:  1  3.846 N/A:  5  19.23 D/K:  0      0
8. You get special subject area curricula materials.
T:   26    NEVER:  1  3.846 RARELY:  6  23.08 GENERALLY: 13     50 ALWAYS:  1  3.846 N/A:  3  11.54 D/K:  2  7.692
9. You get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision.
T:   26    NEVER:  3  11.54 RARELY:  8  30.77 GENERALLY:  6  23.08 ALWAYS:  4  15.38 N/A:  4  15.38 D/K:  1  3.846
10. You have ready access to current literature.
T:   26    ALWAYS:  1  3.846 GENERALLY: 17  65.38 RARELY:  6  23.08 NEVER:  2  7.692 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0
```

```
07/03/85
Page:      1                  Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
           for: TEACHER  (NOT CERTIFIED)        Survey of Florida Support Services
                                                       INSERVICE TRAINING

11. You have input regarding inservice topics:

T:   26    NEVER:  3  11.54 RARELY:  8  30.77 GENERALLY: 14  53.85  ALWAYS:  1  3.846 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

12. Relevant inservice training is offered locally:

T:   26    TOO MUCH:  0      0 ENOUGH: 10  38.46 TOO LITTLE: 14  53.85 NONE:  2  7.692 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

13. Relevant training is offered regionally:

T:   26    NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  8  30.77 ENOUGH: 16  61.54 TOO MUCH:  1  3.846 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  3.846

14. Relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis:

T:   26    NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE:  6  23.08 ENOUGH:  18  69.23 TOO MUCH:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  2  7.692

15. Your school district or agency gives you release time to attend training
    activities relevant to vision:

T:   26    ALWAYS:  9  34.62 GENERALLY:  10  38.46 RARELY:  5  19.23 NEVER:  1  3.846 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  3.846

16. You are reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice
    activities:

T:   26    ALWAYS:  6  23.08 GENERALLY:  13     50 RARELY:  2  7.692 NEVER:  4  15.38 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  3.846

17. Weekend inservice training activities are convenient:

T:   26    NEVER:  5  19.23 RARELY:  7  26.92 GENERALLY:  12  46.15 ALWAYS:  2  7.692 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

18. You receive information regarding relevant inservice training:

T:   26    ALWAYS:  9  34.62 GENERALLY:  11  42.31 RARELY:  5  19.23 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  3.846

19. The coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities is adequate:

T:   26    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  7  26.92 GENERALLY:  13     50 ALWAYS:  3  11.54 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  3  11.54

20. Regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training
    regarding the needs of visually impaired students:

T:   26    ALWAYS:  0      0 GENERALLY:  7  26.92 RARELY:  12  46.15 NEVER:  4  15.38 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  3  11.54
```

```
07/03/85
Page:      1                    Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
            for: TEACHER    (NOT CERTIFIED)          Survey of Florida Support Services
                                                              ASSESSMENT

21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:   26    ALWAYS:    3  11.54 GENERALLY:  15  57.69 RARELY:    5  19.23  NEVER:    0       0 N/A:    0       0 D/K:    3  11.54

22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:   26    NEVER:    0       0 RARELY:    6  23.08 GENERALLY:  14  53.85 ALWAYS:    2  7.692 N/A:    0       0 D/K:    4  15.38

23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions:

T:   26    NEVER:    0       0 RARELY:    3  11.54 GENERALLY:  14  53.85 ALWAYS:    7  26.92 N/A:    0       0 D/K:    2  7.692

24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of IEPs:

T:   26    NEVER:    0       0 RARELY:    2  7.692 GENERALLY:  18  69.23 ALWAYS:    6  23.08 N/A:    0       0 D/K:    0       0

25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision, OT):

T:   26    ALWAYS:    3  11.54 GENERALLY:  19  73.08 RARELY:    2  7.692 NEVER:    1  3.846 N/A:    0       0 D/K:    1  3.846

26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired
    students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc):

T:   26    NEVER:    1  3.846 RARELY:   10  38.46 GENERALLY:  10  38.46 ALWAYS:    1  3.846 N/A:    0       0 D/K:    4  15.38

27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those
    areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision):

T:   26    ALWAYS:    5  19.23 GENERALLY:  15  57.69 RARELY:    3  11.54 NEVER:    0       0 N/A:    0       0 D/K:    3  11.54

28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special
    skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.):

T:   26    NEVER:    0       0 RARELY:    7  26.92 GENERALLY:  12  46.15 ALWAYS:    2  7.692 N/A:    0       0 D/K:    5  19.23

29. Professionals, parents and students have opportunities to evaluate different
    aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, etc):

T:   26    NEVER:    2  7.692 RARELY:    7  26.92 GENERALLY:  11  42.31 ALWAYS:    4  15.38 N/A:    0       0 D/K:    2  7.692

30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the
    area of visual impairments:

T:   26    ALWAYS:    3  11.54 GENERALLY:   8  30.77 RARELY:    9  34.62 NEVER:    5  19.23 N/A:    0       0 D/K:    1  3.846
```

** Alternate Sort **

TEACHERS: RESIDENTIAL

Total Received: 7

```
07/03/85
Page:      1                   Florida Department of Education •• American Foundation for the Blind
              for: TEACHER  (RESIDENTIAL)          Survey of Florida Support Services
                                                              MATERIALS

1. You get instructional materials needed by your students.

T:    7    NEVER: 0       0 RARELY: 2   28.57 GENERALLY: 2   28.57  ALWAYS:  3  42.86 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

2. The quality of the instructional materials is:

T:    7    EXCELLENT:  0      0 GOOD:  4  57.14 FAIR:  2  28.57 POOR:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  14.29

3. You get current editions of educational materials.

T:    7    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  1  14.29 GENERALLY:  5  71.43 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K: 1  14.29

4. The efficiency of delivery of materials is:

T:    7    ONTIME:  0      0 USUALLY ONTIME:  2  28.57 USUALLY LATE:  3  42.86 ALWAYS LATE:  1  14.29 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  14.29

5. You get information on new developments in technology.

T:    7    NEVER:  2  28.57 RARELY:  1  14.29 GENERALLY:  3  42.86 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  1  14.29 D/K:  0      0

6. You get the technology equipment your students need.

T:    7    NEVER:  0      0 RARELY:  1  14.29 GENERALLY:  4  57.14 ALWAYS:  1  14.29 N/A:  1  14.29 D/K:  0      0

7. You get materials needed by/for special populations.

T:    7    ALWAYS:  0      0 GENERALLY:  1  14.29 RARELY:  3  42.86 NEVER:  2  28.57 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  14.29

8. You get special subject area curricula materials.

T:    7    NEVER:  1  14.29 RARELY:  1  14.29 GENERALLY:  4  57.14 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  14.29

9. You get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision.

T:    7    NEVER:  2  28.57 RARELY:  1  14.29 GENERALLY:  1  14.29 ALWAYS:  1  14.29 N/A:  1  14.29 D/K:  1  14.29

10. You have ready access to current literature.

T:    7    ALWAYS:  2  28.57 GENERALLY:  4  57.14 RARELY:  1  14.29 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0
```

```
07/03/85
Page:       1                 Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
                for: TEACHER  (RESIDENTIAL)            Survey of Florida Support Services
                                                              INSERVICE TRAINING

11. You have input regarding inservice topics:

T:    7    NEVER:  0       0 RARELY:  2  28.57 GENERALLY:  5  71.43  ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

12. Relevant inservice training is offered locally:

T:    7    TOO MUCH:  0       0 ENOUGH:  6  85.71 TOO LITTLE:  1  14.29 NONE:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

13. Relevant training is offered regionally:

T:    7    NONE:  0       0 TOO LITTLE:  2  28.57 ENOUGH:  4  57.14 TOO MUCH:  1  14.29 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

14. Relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis:

T:    7    NONE:  0       0 TOO LITTLE:  1  14.29 ENOUGH:  5  71.43 TOO MUCH:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  14.29

15. Your school district or agency gives you release time to attend training
    activities relevant to vision:

T:    7    ALWAYS:  2  28.57 GENERALLY:  3  42.86 RARELY:  2  28.57 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

16. You are reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice
    activities:

T:    7    ALWAYS:  3  42.86 GENERALLY:  3  42.86 RARELY:  0      0 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  14.29

17. Weekend inservice training activities are convenient:

T:    7    NEVER:  3  42.86 RARELY:  1  14.29 GENERALLY:  2  28.57 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  14.29

18. You receive information regarding relevant inservice training:

T:    7    ALWAYS:  0       0 GENERALLY:  5  71.43 RARELY:  1  14.29 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  14.29

19. The coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities is adequate:

T:    7    NEVER:  0       0 RARELY:  2  28.57 GENERALLY:  4  57.14 ALWAYS:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  14.29

20. Regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training
    regarding the needs of visually impaired students:

T:    7    ALWAYS:  0       0 GENERALLY:  2  28.57 RARELY:  2  28.57 NEVER:  0      0 N/A:  1  14.29 D/K:  2  28.57
```

```
07/03/85                     Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      1                                Survey of Florida Support Services
          for: TEACHER  (RESIDENTIAL)                      ASSESSMENT

21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:    7    ALWAYS:   0       0 GENERALLY:   4  57.14 RARELY:   0      0 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   3  42.86

22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:    7    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   0       0 GENERALLY:   3  42.86 ALWAYS:   1  14.29 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   3  42.86

23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions:

T:    7    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   0       0 GENERALLY:   4  57.14 ALWAYS:   1  14.29 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   2  28.57

24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of IEPs:

T:    7    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   0       0 GENERALLY:   7    100 ALWAYS:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0

25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision, OT):

T:    7    ALWAYS:   1  14.29 GENERALLY:   5  71.43 RARELY:   0      0 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  14.29

26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired
    students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc):

T:    7    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   3  42.86 GENERALLY:   3  42.86 ALWAYS:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  14.29

27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those
    areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision):

T:    7    ALWAYS:   1  14.29 GENERALLY:   4  57.14 RARELY:   1  14.29 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  14.29

28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special
    skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.):

T:    7    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   1  14.29 GENERALLY:   5  71.43 ALWAYS:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   1  14.29

29. Professionals, parents and students have opportunities to evaluate different
    aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, etc):

T:    7    NEVER:   0       0 RARELY:   1  14.29 GENERALLY:   4  57.14 ALWAYS:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   2  28.57

30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the
    area of visual impairments:

T:    7    ALWAYS:   3  42.86 GENERALLY:   3  42.86 RARELY:   1  14.29 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0
```

** Alternate Sort **

TEACHERS: DISTRICT

Total Received: 97

```
07/08/85                        Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
Page:      1                                 Survey of Florida Support Services
            for: TEACHER  (DISTRICT)                       MATERIALS

1. You get instructional materials needed by your students.

T:   97    NEVER: 2   2.062 RARELY: 1   1.031 GENERALLY:23   23.71  ALWAYS: 69  71.13 N/A:  2  2.062 D/K:  0      0

2. The quality of the instructional materials is:

T:   97    EXCELLENT: 23  23.71 GOOD: 61  62.89 FAIR:  6  6.186 POOR:  0     0 N/A:  6  6.186 D/K:  1  1.031

3. You get current editions of educational materials.

T:   97    NEVER:  2  2.062 RARELY:  7  7.216 GENERALLY: 63  64.95 ALWAYS: 22  22.68 N/A:  2  2.062 D/K: 1  1.031

4. The efficiency of delivery of materials is:

T:   97    ONTIME: 13  13.40 USUALLY ONTIME: 70  72.16 USUALLY LATE: 11  11.34 ALWAYS LATE:  0     0 N/A:  3  3.093 D/K:  0      0

5. You get information on new developments in technology.

T:   97    NEVER:  4  4.124 RARELY: 10  10.31 GENERALLY: 56  57.73 ALWAYS: 25  25.77 N/A:  0     0 D/K:  2  2.062

6. You get the technology equipment your students need.

T:   97    NEVER:  1  1.031 RARELY: 25  25.77 GENERALLY: 44  45.36 ALWAYS: 16  16.49 N/A: 10  10.31 D/K:  1  1.031

7. You get materials needed by/for special populations.

T:   97    ALWAYS: 10  10.31 GENERALLY: 60  61.86 RARELY:  9  9.278 NEVER:  3  3.093 N/A: 13  13.40 D/K:  2  2.062

8. You get special subject area curricula materials.

T:   97    NEVER:  5  5.155 RARELY: 19  19.59 GENERALLY: 43  44.33 ALWAYS:  8  8.247 N/A: 16  16.49 D/K:  6  6.186

9. You get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision.

T:   97    NEVER:  7  7.216 RARELY: 25  25.77 GENERALLY: 42  43.30 ALWAYS: 13  13.40 N/A:  7  7.216 D/K:  3  3.093

10. You have ready access to current literature.

T:   97    ALWAYS: 20  20.62 GENERALLY: 51  52.58 RARELY: 20  20.62 NEVER:  5  5.155 N/A:  0     0 D/K:  1  1.031
```

```
07/08/85
Page:      1                 Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
               for: TEACHER   (DISTRICT)          Survey of Florida Support Services
                                                          INSERVICE TRAINING

11. You have input regarding inservice topics:

T:   97    NEVER:  7  7.216 RARELY: 18  18.56 GENERALLY: 56  57.73  ALWAYS: 16  16.49 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

12. Relevant inservice training is offered locally:

T:   97    TOO MUCH:  0      0 ENOUGH: 21  21.65 TOO LITTLE: 56  57.73 NONE: 20  20.62 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

13. Relevant training is offered regionally:

T:   97    NONE:  3  3.093 TOO LITTLE: 44  45.36 ENOUGH: 49  50.52 TOO MUCH:  0      0 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  1  1.031

14. Relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis:

T:   97    NONE:  2  2.062 TOO LITTLE: 29  29.90 ENOUGH:  62  63.92 TOO MUCH:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   4  4.124

15. Your school district or agency gives you release time to attend training
    activities relevant to vision:

T:   97    ALWAYS:  29  29.90 GENERALLY:  49  50.52 RARELY:  15  15.46 NEVER:  1  1.031 N/A:  1  1.031 D/K:  2  2.062

16. You are reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice
    activities:

T:   97    ALWAYS:  18  18.56 GENERALLY:  43  44.33 RARELY:  22  22.68 NEVER:  11  11.34 N/A:  1  1.031 D/K:  2  2.062

17. Weekend inservice training activities are convenient:

T:   97    NEVER:  11  11.34 RARELY:  37  38.14 GENERALLY:  43  44.33 ALWAYS:  3  3.093 N/A:  1  1.031 D/K:  2  2.062

18. You receive information regarding relevant inservice training:

T:   97    ALWAYS:  29  29.90 GENERALLY:  55  56.70 RARELY:  10  10.31 NEVER:  3  3.093 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  0      0

19. The coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities is adequate:

T:   97    NEVER:  2  2.062 RARELY:  22  22.68 GENERALLY:  53  54.64 ALWAYS:  7  7.216 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  13  13.40

20. Regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training
    regarding the needs of visually impaired students:

T:   97    ALWAYS:  3  3.093 GENERALLY:  18  18.56 RARELY:  51  52.58 NEVER:  21  21.65 N/A:  0      0 D/K:  4  4.124
```

```
07/08/85
Page:      1                           Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
          for: TEACHER  (DISTRICT)                   Survey of Florida Support Services
                                                              ASSESSMENT

21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:   97    ALWAYS:  10  10.31 GENERALLY:  50  51.55 RARELY:  29  29.90  NEVER:   4  4.124 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   4  4.124

22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:   97    NEVER:   4  4.124 RARELY:  30  30.93 GENERALLY:  46  47.42 ALWAYS:  13  13.40 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   4  4.124

23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions:

T:   97    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:  17  17.53 GENERALLY:  53  54.64 ALWAYS:  23  23.71 N/A:   1  1.031 D/K:   3  3.093

24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of IEPs:

T:   97    NEVER:   2  2.062 RARELY:   8  8.247 GENERALLY:  59  60.82 ALWAYS:  28  28.87 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   0      0

25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision, OT):

T:   97    ALWAYS:  16  16.49 GENERALLY:  58  59.79 RARELY:  19  19.59 NEVER:   3  3.093 N/A:   1  1.031 D/K:   0      0

26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired
    students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc):

T:   97    NEVER:   5  5.155 RARELY:  34  35.05 GENERALLY:  46  47.42 ALWAYS:   3  3.093 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   9  9.278

27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those
    areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision):

T:   97    ALWAYS:  12  12.37 GENERALLY:  71  73.20 RARELY:   8  8.247 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   6  6.186

28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special
    skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.):

T:   97    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:  19  19.59 GENERALLY:  60  61.86 ALWAYS:   5  5.155 N/A:   2  2.062 D/K:  11  11.34

29. Professionals, parents and students have opportunities to evaluate different
    aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, etc):

T:   97    NEVER:   5  5.155 RARELY:  34  35.05 GENERALLY:  41  42.27 ALWAYS:  13  13.40 N/A:   0      0 D/K:   4  4.124

30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the
    area of visual impairments:

T:   97    ALWAYS:   5  5.155 GENERALLY:  27  27.84 RARELY:  36  37.11 NEVER:  27  27.84 N/A:   1  1.031 D/K:   1  1.031
```

** Alternate Sort **

ALL CATEGORIES EXCEPT TEACHERS

Total Received: 50

```
07/08/85
Page:      1                  Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
           for:  ALL OTHER CATEGORIES EXCEPT    Survey of Florida Support Services
                 TEACHERS                                  MATERIALS

 1. You get instructional materials needed by your students.

T:   50    NEVER: 1      2 RARELY: 3      6 GENERALLY:11     22  ALWAYS: 21     42 N/A: 10     20 D/K:  4     8

 2. The quality of the instructional materials is:

T:   50    EXCELLENT:  9     18 GOOD: 21     42 FAIR:  2      4 POOR:  0      0 N/A: 11     22 D/K:  7     14

 3. You get current editions of educational materials.

T:   50    NEVER:  0     0 RARELY:  0     0 GENERALLY: 19     38 ALWAYS: 10     20 N/A: 15     30 D/K: 6     12

 4. The efficiency of delivery of materials is:

T:   50    ONTIME: 10     20 USUALLY ONTIME: 17     34 USUALLY LATE:  5     10 ALWAYS LATE:  0     0 N/A: 11     22 D/K:  7     14

 5. You get information on new developments in technology.

T:   50    NEVER:  1     2 RARELY:  2     4 GENERALLY: 23     46 ALWAYS: 12     24 N/A:  8     16 D/K:  4     8

 6. You get the technology equipment your students need.

T:   50    NEVER:  0     0 RARELY:  2     4 GENERALLY: 26     52 ALWAYS:  6     12 N/A: 10     20 D/K:  6     12

 7. You get materials needed by/for special populations.

T:   50    ALWAYS:  5     10 GENERALLY: 23     46 RARELY:  5     10 NEVER:  0     0 N/A: 12     24 D/K:  5     10

 8. You get special subject area curricula materials.

T:   50    NEVER:  1     2 RARELY:  7     14 GENERALLY: 20     40 ALWAYS:  3     6 N/A: 14     28 D/K:  5     10

 9. You get curricula for special subject areas unique to vision.

T:   50    NEVER:  1     2 RARELY:  7     14 GENERALLY: 18     36 ALWAYS: 10     20 N/A: 10     20 D/K:  4     8

10. You have ready access to current literature.

T:   50    ALWAYS: 12     24 GENERALLY: 25     50 RARELY:  2     4 NEVER:  0     0 N/A:  6     12 D/K:  5     10
```

```
07/08/85
Page:      1                 Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
            for:  ALL OTHER CATEGORIES            Survey of Florida Support Services
                  EXCEPT TEACHERS                         INSERVICE TRAINING

11. You have input regarding inservice topics:

T:   50    NEVER:  1      2 RARELY:  6     12 GENERALLY: 24     48  ALWAYS: 13     26 N/A:  3     6 D/K:  3     6

12. Relevant inservice training is offered locally:

T:   50    TOO MUCH:  0      0 ENOUGH: 22     44 TOO LITTLE: 14     28 NONE:  4     8 N/A:  3     6 D/K:  7     14

13. Relevant training is offered regionally:

T:   50    NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE: 14     28 ENOUGH: 25     50 TOO MUCH:  0     0 N/A:  3     6 D/K:  8     16

14. Relevant inservice training is offered on a state-wide basis:

T:   50    NONE:  0      0 TOO LITTLE: 10     20 ENOUGH:  29     58 TOO MUCH:  1     2 N/A:  3     6 D/K:  7     14

15. Your school district or agency gives you release time to attend training
    activities relevant to vision:

T:   50    ALWAYS:  17     34 GENERALLY:  21     42 RARELY:  1     2 NEVER:  1     2 N/A:  5     10 D/K:  5     10

16. You are reimbursed for expenses incurred during travel to/from inservice
    activities:

T:   50    ALWAYS:  23     46 GENERALLY:  15     30 RARELY:  2     4 NEVER:  0     0 N/A:  5     10 D/K:  5     10

17. Weekend inservice training activities are convenient:

T:   50    NEVER:  5     10 RARELY:  16     32 GENERALLY:  17     34 ALWAYS:  1     2 N/A:  6     12 D/K:  5     10

18. You receive information regarding relevant inservice training:

T:   50    ALWAYS:  14     28 GENERALLY:  24     48 RARELY:  4     8 NEVER:  0     0 N/A:  5     10 D/K:  3     6

19. The coordination among agencies regarding inservice activities is adequate:

T:   50    NEVER:  1     2 RARELY:  11     22 GENERALLY:  24     48 ALWAYS:  5     10 N/A:  3     6 D/K:  6     12

20. Regular education teachers adequately provided with inservice training
    regarding the needs of visually impaired students:

T:   50    ALWAYS:  3     6 GENERALLY:  11     22 RARELY:  15     30 NEVER:  1     2 N/A:  8     16 D/K:  12     24
```

```
07/08/85
Page:       1                      Florida Department of Education ** American Foundation for the Blind
            for:   ALL OTHER CATEGORIES                 Survey of Florida Support Services
                   EXCEPT TEACHERS                                 ASSESSMENT

21. The individual(s) performing assessments are qualified to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:   50    ALWAYS:  12     24 GENERALLY:  21     42 RARELY:   6     12  NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   4      8 D/K:   7     14

22. Appropriate resources and instruments are available to assess visually
    impaired students:

T:   50    NEVER:   2      4 RARELY:   3      6 GENERALLY:  23     46 ALWAYS:   9     18 N/A:   5     10 D/K:   8     16

23. Assessment data are a basis for educational placement decisions:

T:   50    NEVER:   1      2 RARELY:   1      2 GENERALLY:  18     36 ALWAYS:  18     36 N/A:   5     10 D/K:   7     14

24. Assessment data are a basis for the development of IEPs:

T:   50    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   3      6 GENERALLY:  12     24 ALWAYS:  22     44 N/A:   5     10 D/K:   8     16

25. Specialized assessments by ancillary personnel are available (low vision, OT):

T:   50    ALWAYS:  11     22 GENERALLY:  24     48 RARELY:   3      6 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   4      8 D/K:   8     16

26. Assessments are appropriate for special populations of visually impaired
    students (gifted, bilingual, multiply handicapped, etc):

T:   50    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   7     14 GENERALLY:  24     48 ALWAYS:   6     12 N/A:   5     10 D/K:   8     16

27. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in those
    areas required by the state of Florida (medical, social, functional vision):

T:   50    ALWAYS:  12     24 GENERALLY:  22     44 RARELY:   4      8 NEVER:   0      0 N/A:   4      8 D/K:   8     16

28. Formal and informal assessment instruments used are appropriate in special
    skills areas (technology, utilization of low vision, etc.):

T:   50    NEVER:   0      0 RARELY:   2      4 GENERALLY:  26     52 ALWAYS:   7     14 N/A:   4      8 D/K:  11     22

29. Professionals, parents and students have opportunities to evaluate different
    aspects of the program for visually handicapped students (curriculum, etc):

T:   50    NEVER:   1      2 RARELY:   7     14 GENERALLY:  19     38 ALWAYS:   9     18 N/A:   4      8 D/K:  10     20

30. The skills of professionals are evaluated by persons knowledgeable in the
    area of visual impairments:

T:   50    ALWAYS:   8     16 GENERALLY:  21     42 RARELY:   6     12 NEVER:   2      4 N/A:   3      6 D/K:  10     20
```

HV2120
H87
c3

American
The AFB study of
support services to
visually impaired

DATE DUE

AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND
15 WEST 16th STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10011